This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google

MISCELLANEA:

COMPRISING

Reviews, Lectures, and Essays,

ON

Historical, Theological, and Miscellaneous Subjects.

BY M. J. SPALDING, D.D.

ARCHBISHOP OF BALTIMORE

Quæcumque in foliis descripsit . . .
Digerit in numerum, ...
Ne turbata volent rapidis ludibria ventis.

What time and place disjoin, is here combined,
Lest sporting winds disperse the flying leaves.—VIRGIL

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.—HISTORICAL.

SIXTH EDITION, REVISED AND GREATLY ENLARGED.

BALTIMORE:
PUBLISHED BY JOHN MURPHY & CO.
182 BALTIMORE STREET.
1875.

Hosted by Google

ENTERED, according to an Act of Congress, in the year 1866, by WEBB, GILL & LEVERING, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the District of Kentucky.

ENTERED, according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1866, BY JOHN MURPHY, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Maryland.

Hosted by Google

Preface to the Fourth Edition.

Eleven years ago, the first edition of the following work was published, and it was speedily followed by two others. The interest awakened in the public mind by the Know-Nothing movement, then at its highest point of excitement, caused many non-Catholics, who had never previously examined the merits of the Catholic Church, to read with eagerness every thing which fell in their way having reference to the great religious question, now become one of vast political importance. The result was most favorable to the cause of truth. The Catholic Church courts, and she is benefited by earnest inquiry; she has no concealment. It was found, that the charges made against Catholics were wholly unfounded, and that they originated in blind prejudice, aggravated by interested motives. The leaders of the movement could hope to obtain power and lucrative office, only by passing over the ruins of the Catholic Church. Those unprincipled men were happily foiled in their unworthy efforts, and the Church came out of the conflict much stronger than she had gone into it; thus adding another to the thousand brilliant victories she had achieved, in the battle-fields of the world and of history, over the unbridled passions of men.

The Introductory Address refers to the state of things which existed in this Country in the Spring and Summer of 1855, while the storm of persecution was brewing against the Church; and though the popular excitement against the Catholics has happily, to a great extent, since passed away, or at least been greatly calmed down, and has been succeeded by more just and liberal sentiments, yet it has been thought well to preserve the Address in the present edition, with some modifications, partly as an historical remembrancer of old-time prejudice, and partly because it treats of subjects which are of more than passing interest, and which may again come up, should another attempt be made to put down the Church by popular clamor and unreasoning bigotry. A feeble effort of the kind was made a few months ago, but it seems to have awakened no echo in the popular mind, which can seldom be a second time deceived in the same direction.

To the Essays, Reviews, and Lectures contained in the previous editions, we have in this added many new ones, some of the latter hav-

Hosted by Google

ing been written since the former were issued. According to the judgment of perhaps over-partial friends, these are considered of sufficient importance, to be preserved in a more permanent form than in the columns of Magazines and Reviews. The additional matter, thus given to the public in the present edition, amounts to upwards of one hundred and sixty pages, including the new notices prefixed to most of the newly published articles.

While I have sought carefully to revise all the papers contained in these Volumes—now amounting to forty-seven—I could not correct the style or modify the tone of them, without re-writing the whole; a task rendered impossible by numerous and engrossing occupations. As some of them were written as far back as twenty years, it is but natural to suppose that they occasionally exhibit more spirit and heat in argument, than the cooler temper and riper taste of advancing years would fully approve. While I am free to make this acknowledgment, justice to my own convictions and feelings requires me to state, that in regard to the facts alleged, I have nothing to retract or even materially to modify, and that in the tone and temper I do not even now believe, that I set down ought in malice, or with any other than the good intent of correcting error and establishing truth, without assuming the aggressive, except for the sake of what I believed to be the legitimate defense of the Church of God.

Such as these papers are, they are again offered to an impartial public, with an earnest wish, that they may not prove wholly unprofitable to the cause of historic truth and of true Religion.

BALTIMORE, *Easter Monday*, 1866.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF A NEW EDITION.

ARCHBISHOP SPALDING had intended to issue a complete and uniform edition of all his works; and he was occupied with this task when his last illness came upon him. The new and revised edition of the HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION, the EVIDENCES OF CATHOLICITY, and the MISCELLANEA, which is now offered to the Public, was prepared by Archbishop Spalding himself—the corrections and additions being from his own hand. To the *Evidences of Catholicity*, as the reader will perceive, he has added his Pastoral Letter on the Infallibility of the Pope; and to the *History of the Reformation*, he has appended an Article entitled: *Rome and Geneva*.

The *Life of Bishop Flaget* and the *Sketches of Kentucky*, which Archbishop Spalding intended to re-write and publish in one volume, are not contained in the present edition of his works, since the corrections and additions, which it had been his purpose to make, are incomplete.

BALTIMORE, *Sept.* 8, 1875.

Hosted by Google

CONTENTS.

PREFACE, ... v

INRODUCTORY ADDRESS.

An intolerant spirit invoked against Catholics—Bigotry an implacable monster—The danger of fostering the mob spirit—Features in the present anti-Catholic crusade—Cruel treatment of a Catholic priest—Our adversaries virtually yielding us the victory in fair argument—Their numerous inconsistencies—The Newark outrage—The *manliness* of the American character—Whence danger is to be apprehended to the Republic—The "bats and the eagles"—Hoping for better things—The accusations against us—Is the Catholic Church intolerant?—Or uncharitable?—Latitudinarianism, not charity—Principles of the Church in regard to persecution—Has she ever persecuted as a Church?—Third canon of Lateran—The Inquisition—John Huss—Catholic and Protestant persecution since the reformation—Intolerance in America—Who originated it, and who gave the first example of toleration?—Parallel between Catholic and Protestant countries in the matter of persecution—Are Catholics the enemies of republican government?—What Catholicity and Protestantism have done for human liberty—Charles Carroll of Carrolton—Washington and the Catholics—The temporal power of the Popes—Declarations of Archbishop Carroll and the American Bishops—Letter to the Pope—Are American Catholics a separate community?—Archbishop Carroll and Bishop Dubourg—Foreigners—What they have done for the country—"The foreign vote"—Foreign radicals and infidels—The naturalization laws—The common school system—What the Catholic Church says to her members—Her efforts to promote peace and order—Her charity for all mankind—Archbishop Kenrick's Pastoral. xvii

VOL. I.—PART I. HISTORICAL.

I. CHURCH HISTORY.—THE EARLY AGES.

Palma and Palmer as historians—Rome and Oxford—Gratuitous assertions—Promises of Christ in favor of the Church—Essential and Non-essential doctrines—Bishop Whittingham—Puseyism—Palmer's division—Purity of early church—The Age of persecution—Donatists—Striking avowal—Peter in Rome—The "Thundering Legion"—*Disciplina arcani*—Testimonies of Saints Ignatius and Justin on Holy Eucharist—Cases of Popes Victor and Stephen—The Primacy—St. Irenæus—The Cross of Constantine—Early heresies—Church of Rome—Story of Liberius and of Honorius I.—Monastic Life—Holy Virginity—Nestorius—St. Cyril of Alexandria—St Patrick—Early British churches—Primitive Irish churches—St. Simeon Stylites—"Rank Popery"—Early "abuses and corruptions"—Wisdom of the Church—The Seventh and Eighth General Councils. 17

II. CHURCH HISTORY.—THE MIDDLE AGES.

A different division suggested—Triumphs of the Church over barbarism—Missionaries sent by Rome—The Ages of Faith—Auricular Confession—Testimonies of Tertullian and St. Cyprian—Nectarius and the Penitentiary—Puseyite view of the Holy Eucharist—Paschasius Radbert and Berengarius—Temporal authority of the Pope and Bishops—Decretals of Isidore—Prerogatives of the Roman Pontiffs—Pope Julius I.—Greek Schism—Order of pre-eminence—Michael Cerularius—Shaving the beard—The Nicene Canons—Edifying incident of St Anselm—Modern Anglican parsons—Vision of "Roman attempts at usurpation"—Have the promises of Christ failed?—The Roman Primacy acknowledged by the early Greek Church—And at Councils of Lyons and Florence—When was the doctrine of the Primacy defined?—Purgatory—Transubstantiation—Indulgences—Protestant *Indulgences*—Penitential works—Repudiating the debt—The Rosary—"The pure and holy One"—Temporal power of the Pope—Its influence on civilization. 37

III. CHURCH HISTORY.—SINCE THE REFORMATION

Necessity of calm impartiality—Protestant and Catholic views of Reformation—Wickliffe and Huss—Oriental languages—Foreign and British reformation—Luther and Carlostadt—Curious anachronism—Luther and Episcopacy—Anglican branch of the reformation—"Scruples of Henry VIII."—The new Gospel light—The Anglican Pope—Royal prerogative predominant—Cromwell Vicar

Hosted by Google

General—Base servility of first Anglican Bishops—Fisher and Moore—Burning Protestants and Catholics—Palmer's theory of Anglican reformation examined—Downright tyranny—Trait of noble independence—Edward VI.—Married clergy—*Improvements* of Anglican liturgy—Return to unity under Mary—Bull of St. Pius V.—Henry's divorce—Reformation in Ireland—How the Anglican church was *persecuted* in Ireland—Dr. Lingard's testimony and proofs—Anglican saints—Ridley—Macaulay's portrait of Cranmer—A parallel—Infidelity of Protestant origin—Anglican infidels—Suppression of Anglican convocation—Church and state—Where Voltaire learned infidelity—Infidels in Protestant Europe—French clergy during the Revolution—Did the French Revolution make any *Protestant* martyrs?—Conclusion, - - - - - - - - - - 57

IV. LITERATURE AND THE ARTS IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

Importance of the subject—Writers who have treated it—Division—A Colossus falling—Incursions of the Northmen—A deluge—Beautiful Italy—Awful devastation—New dynasties—Christianity triumphant over barbarism—Civilization—Literary history—Tenth century—Gradual revival—Its causes—Golden age of Leo X.—Latin language in liturgy—And the Monastic institute—Elevation of woman—Modern languages—And poetry—Paper—Art of Printing—Illuminated manuscripts—Universities—Schools of Law and Medicine—Musical Notes—Organs—Bells—Mariner's compass—Geographical discoveries—Commerce—First Bank—Post Office—Newspapers—Spectacles—Gunpowder—Stone coal—Arithmetical numbers—Algebra—Glass—Stained Glass—Agriculture—Botany—Clocks—Painting revived—Silk introduced—Gothic style of Architecture—Leaning tower of Pisa—Conclusion, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 77

V. LITERATURE AND THE CATHOLIC CLERGY.—LIBRARIES.

Modern history unfair—A great conspiracy against the truth—Whence this unfairness in English writers—Robbery and sacrilege—Origin of modern mammonism—Persecution of slander—What Protestants have said in favor of the Monks—Leibnitz—Ellendorf—Edmund Burke—Raising up the lowly—Giving asylum to the oppressed—Bishop Tanner—Mallet—Drake—Sharon Turner—Bates—Quarterly Review—Origin of Libraries—Ancient Christian Libraries—Cathedral and Monastic Libraries—Monks transcribing books—And collecting them into Libraries—Care of books enjoined by rule—Zeal of Monks in saving books—Principal monastic collections of Manuscripts—Scarcity of books—Agency of the Universities—Religious women engaged as copyists—Writing with golden and silver ink—Illuminated margins—The *Scriptorium*—Means of augmenting Libraries—Encouragement afforded by Roman Pontiffs—What we owe to patient Monastic labor—Summary of what the Clergy and Monks have done for Literature, - - - - - - - 96

VI. SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE "DARK" AGES.

Protestant boasting—Light and darkness—Revival of letters and the Reformation—Early and recent persecution of slander compared—Gibbon—Protestant theory—Lame argument—Early Christian Schools—Plato and Aristotle—Irish Schools—And Irish Scholars—Cathedral Schools—Charlemagne and Alfred—Councils ordering the erection of Schools—The Monasteries—And monastic Schools—What was therein taught—Schools for the nobility—Signing in cipher—Female Academies—Literary ladies—Universities—In Italy—England—And France—Statement of Danielo examined—Curious incident in the history of the University of Paris—Three qualities of mediæval Schools and Universities stated and established—Who first founded Free Schools?—Glance at modern Universities. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 113

VII. INFLUENCE OF CATHOLICITY ON CIVIL LIBERTY.

Terms defined—What is liberty?—Which is the best form of government?—Direct and indirect influence—Tendency of Christian teaching—Division of the subject—Theoretical view—Equalizing the social condition—Form of Church government—A happy blending of different elements—The elective principle—Deliberative assemblies—Authority of the Pope—Practical influence of the Church—In the early ages—In the middle ages—Rescuing Europe from barbarism—Means employed for humanizing society—Two Protestant testimonies—Slavery and the serf system—Struggle between the Cross and the Crescent—The Crusades—Their influence on the social condition—The Free Cities—In Spain—In Germany—And in Italy—Lombard League—Italian Republics—Guelphs and Ghibellines—The deposing power—Republics of San Marino and Andorra—The monastic institute—Teaching of mediæval theologians—*Magna Charta*—William Wallace, Robert Bruce, and William Tell—Influence of the reformation on liberty—In Germany—And in England—Catholic patriots during the American revolution—Conclusion, 131

Hosted by Google

VIII. AGE OF POPE GREGORY VII.—THE DEPOSING POWER.

Importance of the subject—Society struggling into form—Hildebrand—His cotemporaries—Historical portraits and parallels—Napoleon's opinion of Gregory VII.—How the Pontiff has been attacked by his enemies—And how defended by Voigt—The great idea of Gregory—His relations to society as its spiritual head—A torrent of abuse stemmed—The question of investitures—Ancient mode of nominating to bishoprics—Contest between the Popes and the emperors of Germany—Papal election—A vital question—St. Peter Damian—His relations to Gregory—Simony and disorder among the clergy—Hildebrand unanimously elected Pope—His earlier career—His experience, coolness, and wisdom—Not exceedingly stern—His wonderful activity—His correspondence—His moral courage—His temporal relations to society—Distracted state of Europe—Princes swearing fealty to the Pope—His protectorate recognized and invoked—Gregory not ambitious—His long struggle with Henry IV.—The Nero of the twelfth century—Otto of Nordheim—Summary of the whole contest—Moderation of Gregory—How and why the Pontiff declared Henry deposed—A stroke for liberty—Opinion of Voigt, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 151

IX. THE GREAT SCHISM OF THE WEST.—ROME AND AVIGNON.

The Reformers before the Reformation—Bonnechose and D'Aubigné compared—The former as an historian—Is he ingenuous or fair?—Inaccuracies—Scope of his work—The Schism a fiery ordeal for the Church—From which she came forth unscathed—Scandals to be expected—Morality of the Popes—Origin of the Schism—The papacy "stooping to conquer"—Contest between Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair—The death of Boniface and election of his successor—Intrigues of Philip—The Popes reside at Avignon—Their policy—Return to Rome—Election of Urban VI.—Defection of Cardinals—They set up Clement VII.—Who moves to Avignon—Political ambition of princes—The evil and the remedy come from France—University of Paris—Council of Pisa—And of Constance—Election of Martin V.—End of the Schism—Remarks—Triumph of the Church—Relation of the Pope to a general council—Reforming the Church "in its head and members"—The succession not interrupted—Two objections answered—Church emerged from the Schism stronger than ever—And so did the papacy, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 169

X. JOHN HUSS AND THE HUSSITES.—THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE.

New trials lead to new triumphs of the Church—Character of John Huss—A traitor in the camp—Seeking popularity—Wickliffe and his doctrines—These necessarily lead to civil commotions—Translated into Bohemia—University of Prague—The German and Bohemian students—Carthaginian hatred of Rome—Writers on Huss and his disciples—Persecution no Catholic tenet—Imperial laws on the subject—What were the doctrines of Huss?—And what their influence on society?—What means did he adopt to spread them?—Was he consistent?—Had he a fair trial at Constance?—Was the council cruel towards him?—Were the fathers guilty of breach of faith?—Keeping faith with heretics—Case of Jerome of Prague—Horrible excesses of the Hussites—Ziska "of the Cup"—Pillage, murder, and sacrilege—A horrid martial instrument of music—A dark and bloody monument to the memory of Huss, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 191

XI. THE SPANISH INQUISITION.—PRESCOTT'S VIEW.

Interest of Spanish history—Evils arising from the French revolution—Can Spain become Protestant?—Prescott's Ferdinand and Isabella—His character as an historian—His prejudices—His authorities on the Spanish Inquisition—Who was Limborch?—His reliability—Character of Llorente—Writers on the other side—Prescott's view—His statements examined—Three propositions established—Was the Spanish Inquisition a religious or a political institution?—Its origin traced—A parallel case—Remarkable testimony of Ranke—The alleged cruelties of the Inquisition—Are they exaggerated?—Authority of Voltaire—Of Bourgoing—And of Limborch—The civil and ecclesiastical courts—"Justice and Mercy"—Mode of procedure—Motive for secresy—Torture—Jurisprudence of the time—In what court was the final decision given?—Count Polnitz—English and Genevan Inquisition—Was counsel allowed the accused?—Is the Catholic Church responsible for the Spanish Inquisition?—Agency of the Roman Pontiffs—Their efforts to restrain cruelty—The Portuguese Inquisition, - 213

XII. THE REFORMATION IN SWITZERLAND.—BERNESE INTRIGUES.

The late religious war in Switzerland—Policy of France and Austria—Intrigues of England—Character of the war—Whence the liberties of Switzerland—Analogy between the late struggle, and that preceding the Reformation—Berne the center of operations—M. de Haller's point of view—

Hosted by Google

His character as an historian—His authorities—Wavering of Berne—Tortuous policy—How she embraced the Reform—The *bear* and the *pears*—Treacherous perjury of Berne—Zwinglian Council—Its decrees—Religious liberty crushed—Riot and sacrilege—Proceedings of Bernese commissioners—Downright tyranny—The minister Farel—His *fiery* zeal—An appalling picture—A parallel—Priests hunted down—Character of the ministers—Avowal of Capito—The glorious privilege of private judgment—How consistent!—Persecution of brother Protestants—Drowning the Anabaptists—Reformation in Geneva—Rapid summary of horrors—The Bernese army of invasion—The sword and the Bible—Forbearance of Catholics—Affecting incident at Soleure—The war of Cappell—Points of resemblance—An *armed* apostle—A prophet quailing before danger—Battle of Cappell—Death of Zwingle—Triumph of Catholic cantons—Treaty of Peace, - - - - - 234

XIII. PRESCOTT'S CONQUEST OF MEXICO.

Article I.—Character of the Conquerors.

Prescott as an historian—Compared with other American writers—His style and manner—Qualities essential to an historian—Prescott's research—His authorities—His accuracy—His impartiality—His religious prejudices—The ghost of the Inquisition haunts him—His gross charges against the Catholic Church—His enthusiasm awakened—Romantic character of the conquest—Rapid sketch of its history—Character of the conquerors—Hernando Cortes—Compared with ancient generals—Was the conquest justifiable?—Principles and facts bearing on this question—Horrid human sacrifices among the Aztecs—The Spaniards and the Puritans compared—Were the conquerors wantonly cruel? Facts and specifications alleged and explained—Palliating circumstances—Seizure of Montezuma—And execution of Guatamozin—Prescott's testimony—Spanish conquest of Mexico and English conquest of India compared—Cortes and Lord Clive—Macaulay, - - - - - 250

XIV. PRESCOTT'S CONQUEST OF MEXICO.

Article II.—The Religious Point of View of the Conquest.

Religious point of view necessary—Noble sentiment of Lope de Vega—Spaniards much influenced by it—Prescott's testimony—The Spanish cavalier, a soldier of the Cross—Injustice done his character by Prescott—The age of chivalry compared with the present—Motives which actuated Catholic and Protestant navigators and pioneers—A holy Crusade—Religious character of Cortes—His standard—Stirring address to his soldiers—The Cross unfurled—And animating the army—Zeal for the conversion of the natives—Religious rites and worship—Relative adaptation of Catholic and Protestant systems for making proselytes—Prescott's theory examined—Remarkable incidents showing the piety of the conquerors—Their zeal sometimes too fiery—Catholic missionaries—They oppose cruelty to the natives—As well as all forced conversions—Las Casas and Olmedo—Alleged intemperate zeal of Cortes—Idols cast down—Explanation and defense—Charitable zeal of Olmedo—Aquilar and other missionaries—Religious ceremonies on launching the fleet—And at the termination of the siege—Missionaries after the Conquest—Destruction of the Teocallis—Great number of converts among the Aztecs—How accounted for—Prescott's theory—"The Aztec worship and Romish ritual!"—Alleged similarity between the two—Curious coincidences—Alleged miracles—Loss and gain to the Church—Conclusion, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 275

XV. EARLY CATHOLIC MISSIONS IN THE NORTH WEST.

First Paper.—Bancroft's Account.

Bancroft as an historian—An old *Relation*—Catholic missionary zeal—Spirit of Catholic and Protestant colonists compared—Who established the first missions in North America?—The Franciscans and Jesuits—The first Jesuit missionaries—The first college—And the first hospital—The Ursulines in Canada—The mission to the Hurons—Fathers De Brebeuf and Daniel—Their manner of life—The chief Ahasistari—Mission to the Algonquins—And to the Chippewas—"The New England Elliott"—Father Jogues—And Father Bressani—Mission among the Abenakis—Mohawks—Onondagas—And Cayugas—Extent of the missions—Penetrating westward—Father Marquette—His death—Subsequent history of the Jesuit missions—Policy of England, - - - - 298

XVI. EARLY CATHOLIC MISSIONS IN THE NORTH WEST.

Second Paper.—The Huron Mission.

A beautiful spectacle—Reclaiming the savage—Details of the Mission among the Hurons—The nation of Christians—An Indian council—A touching incident—A picture of primitive fervor—Edifying anecdotes—Triumphs of grace—Attack of the Huron villages—Father Daniel—His glorious mar-

Hosted by Google

tyrdom—His virtues—Another attack by the Iroquois—Heroic conduct of Fathers de Brebeuf and Lallement—They are made prisoners—Devotedness of their neophytes—The glories of the Huron Mission scattered. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 311

XVII. EARLY CATHOLIC MISSIONS IN THE NORTH WEST.

Third Paper—Fathers De Brebeuf and Lallement.

Martyrdom of Fathers de Brebeuf and Lallement—Their remains solemnly interred—Their heroism —Details of their martyrdom—Horrible cruelties—Life of Father Lallement—His reasons for devoting himself to the Indian missions—The Aloysius of the Huron missions—And the Xavier—Father John De Brebeuf—Sketch of his life—His first attempt to found the Huron mission—His ardent zeal—And spirit of prayer—His love of the cross—He pants for martyrdom—His difficulties and sufferings among the Hurons—He is exposed to imminent danger of his life—His humility—His unceasing labors—His calmness—And noble courage—The results of his zeal—The Apostle of the Hurons, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 322

XVIII. WEBSTER'S BUNKER HILL SPEECH.

Relative Treatment of the American Aborigines by the English and Spanish Colonists.

Mr. Webster as an orator—Compared with Preston, Calhoun, and Clay—Mr. Webster's omissions—His drift—A sound principle—But inconclusive reasoning—Different policy adopted by English and Spanish colonists—"The Anglo Saxon blood"—A parallel case—Cause of aversion to Spain—The reformation of Luther—Its influence on liberty—"The middle class"—Luther and the peasants —Protestant opinions—Religious element in Spanish colonization—Irving's testimony—Portuguese colonists—Catholic and Protestant navigators—Who introduced slavery?—Alleged cruelties of the Spaniards—Las Casas—Cruelties practised by the Puritans—Their treatment of the Aborigines—The Pokanokets—Shrewd bargaining—King Philip—The Narragansetts—Their extermination —The Pequods—"The godly Stone"—A horrible conflagration—Settling accounts—"A dark shade on the soil of Massachusetts," - - - - - - - - - - - - 338

XIX. OUR COLONIAL BLUE LAWS.

Article I.—Union of Church and State.

Why we treat this subject—Who are, and who have been the persecutors?—Meaning of the term *Blue Laws*—Effort at concealment—Bancroft's reserve—Other historians of New England—Character of the Puritans—Their good and their bad qualities—Their treatment of the Aborigines—Their inconsistency—Two classes of Blue Laws—Union of Church and State—Conformity—The franchise —Established religion—Observance of the Sabbath—Severe enactments—Law against priests—Spirit of persecution in New York—Miscellaneous laws—Indians and wolves—Use of tobacco—Manner of dress—Cut of the hair—Matrimony—And divorce—By whom were the Blue Laws repealed?—Some Blue Laws of Virginia—The land of "steady habits"—Catholic Colony of Maryland, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 358

XX. OUR COLONIAL BLUE LAWS.

Article II.—Heretics, Quakers, and Witches.

Two characteristics of the Puritans—Scenting out heresy and witchcraft—Preaching and practice—Consistency—Which colony deserves the palm—Roger Williams—His principles and banishment —Laws against Quakers—How executed—A strong protest—How answered—Persecution avowed and proved from the Bible—Witchcraft in New England—Why so prevalent there—Exposition of Cotton Mather—Shrewdness of the witches—How they were exterminated—"Eight firebrands of hell" Hanging first, and trying afterwards—Humorous passage from Irving, - - - - 369

VOL. II.—PART II. THEOLOGICAL.

XXI. THE SPIRIT OF THE AGE.

Temporal and Eternal.

Is this an enlightened age?—Enlightenment and empiricism—Material progress—Constant agitation and fever—Rest and motion—Self-complacency—Two classes of extravagance pointed out—And illustrated—Doctrine of progress applied to religion—Degrading religion to an earthly standard—

Hosted by Google

Reason and faith—Incident related by St. Augustine—Reasoning backwards—A tower of Babel—Modern systems of philosophy—True and false liberty—Evils growing out of sectarianism—Carrying out a false principle—Private judgment—The great struggle and its final issue—Protestantism and enlightenment—American infidelity—Parallel lines of reasoning adopted by the sects and by infidels—Fanaticism and infidelity—Mammonism—Money and virtue—Mammon worship in churches—Utilitarianism—Wrong views of education—Religious indifference and latitudinarianism—Frightful moral disorders—Fruits of Protestantism—The great problem of the age, - 383

XXII. THE CHARGE OF IDOLATRY.

Honor and Invocation of Saints.

The curve and the straight line—The issue of the Puseyite movement—Its benefits—Origin of the controversy concerning Idolatry in the Catholic Church—Palmer and Dr. Wiseman—Charge by the former—How met by the latter—Palmer's criterion applied against himself—His line of reasoning unfair—Three propositions laid down—And proved—Catholic doctrine stated—Testimony by the Council of Trent—The Missal and the Breviary—Why are the Saints honored and invoked?—Passage from the late Pope's encyclical letter explained—Guardian angels—Objected passages explain themselves—Prayer of Cardinal Bona—Incident in the life of St. Alphonsus Liguori—St. Francis di Girolamo—The Pope's encyclical again—Palmer's Italics—The climax of idolatry—Coldness and enthusiasm in devotion—The devotion to the Virgin—Beautiful passage of Dr. Wiseman—Possible abuse no argument—Palmer's inconsistency—Passages from the ancient fathers—How he explains them—His glaring perversion of authorities—His work of supererogation—Faith and practice of the early Church—Beauty and sublimity of the Catholic doctrine—Devotion to the Virgin—A golden chain, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 397

XXIII. THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF SATISFACTION.

Faith and Works.

Harmony of Catholic doctrines—Their scope and influence—The great Physician—His religion medicinal—The doctrine of Satisfaction intimately connected with that of the Atonement—Standing at the foot of the cross—The center of the religious system—Source of light and heat—The Atonement sufficient—And made for all—Our co-operation necessary for its application to us—Denying ourselves and entering into the sacrificial spirit of Christ—Scriptural proofs—Practice of the saints—Motive for corporal austerities—The cross ever present to the Christian mind—The sacrifice of the altar and that of the Cross—Protestant view of the Atonement—Faith and works—Halting half way—The more *comfortable* and the *safer* way—Caustic passage of Tertullian—Two roads to heaven—Palmer's view—His arguments superficial and captious—Temporal punishment for sin already forgiven—Scriptural examples—Palmer's explanation of them refuted—His paltry quibbling—Charge of absurdity answered—Reasons for the temporal penalty remaining—Palmer grows pathetic—Troubling the peace of consciences—Unearthly character of the doctrine—The blessings it has produced, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 418

XXIV. THE CONFESSIONAL.

Tactics of its Enemies.

Strong presumptive evidence of Catholicity—The proud position of the Church—Phases of the warfare against her—Appeal to passion against truth—Luther's tactics—Those of other reformers similar—Protestant and infidel arguments against Catholicity compared—The vilest of all the modes of attack—Closing the church against ladies—Books teeming with obscenity—A burning shame for Christian ministers—Sympathy with infidels—Who was Michelet?—An amusing incident—Translator of Michelet—A horrid picture of woman—Mohammedanism revived—Methodist camp-meetings—A "female Jesuit"—"Incarnation of Satan"—Transcendentalism—A rare consolation!—"French bulls"—Inconsistency and contradiction—Michelet as an historian and logician—His premises false—And his reasoning illogical—Blindness of bigotry—The serpent in paradise—A portrait—"The end justifies the means"—Great honor to the Church—The beams and the mote—The confessional considered by the light of experience—A palpable absurdity—A gross libel upon the sex—Course adopted by the Protestant preachers—Extracts from our theologians—Parallel cases—"Whipping hypocrisy"—Whence all the clamor against the Confessional—Did the priests introduce it?—What motive could they have had?—Was it possible to make the change?—The question of innovation tested—History appealed to—Prescription—Our Saviour and the Pharisees, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 436

Hosted by Google

VOL. II.—PART III. MISCELLANEOUS.

XXV. CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.

Article I.—England and France—Holland and Belgium.

Influence of Catholicity and Protestantism on material interests—Current theory—The argument wholly inconclusive—And the facts assumed, but not proved—England's prosperity—How explained—Rise and decline of Catholic powers—Why God permits the wicked to prosper—Masses of England's population—Catholic Ireland—England and France compared—In which is the bulk of the people more comfortable?—Laing's argument—French and English honesty and politeness—Holland and Belgium compared—Belgian railroads—Charity in Catholic and Protestant countries—Condition of the poor—Relative prosperity of the Catholic and Protestant population of Prussia—The serf system—How long it lingered in Protestant countries—Who have been the best friends and champions of the poor and oppressed? - - - - - - - - - - - 455

XXVI CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.

Article II.—Germany and Italy.

The Catholic and Protestant cantons of Switzerland—An "enlightened self-interest"—Why the Protestant cantons are more prosperous—Material condition of Catholic Italy—Italian and Scotch holy days—Mr. Laing's theory for explaining the alleged social inferiority of the Italians—Italy in ancient and modern times—Influence of climate on popular industry and activity—The Italian poor compared with those of England and Ireland—Mr Laing's testimony—The garden-like culture of Italy—Comparative cheerfulness of Protestant and Catholic nations—Taste for the fine arts—Politeness—Temperance—Testimony of Robert Dale Owen—Comparative morality—Moral condition of Sweden—Popular education in Catholic and Protestant countries—The common school system in Austria—Liberal policy—Relative instruction of English and Belgian operatives—The Prussian common school system—Religious condition—State of religion at Geneva—Deplorable defection—Protestantism in other European countries—Mr. Laing's theory to account for the admitted religious superiority of Catholic nations examined—His honorable testimony to Catholic faith and piety, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 472

XXVII. CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.

Article III.—England, as she is and was.

English boasting—What is the condition of her people?—Has her greatness elevated the masses of her population?—A land of social contrasts—English pauperism a crime—Frightful condition of English operatives—Summary of evidence on the subject—How England relieves her poor—The work houses—The dying pauper—Testimony of Dr. Southey—No liberty for the poor in England—Immorality of London—The Anglican establishment—England evangelizing the world!—The English aristocracy—Brougham on English taxation—Mammonism in England and America—Portrait of Daniel O'Connell, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 492

XXVIII. CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.

Article IV.—Ireland and the Irish.

The great day of reckoning—An historical parallel—Ireland still unconquered—Un-American feeling of hostility to foreigners—Are we really independent of England?—Political nativism—What have foreigners done for the country?—Why Irishmen are hated—The Irish character—Its lights and shades—English treatment of Ireland—The first period of Ireland's sufferings—Protestant evidence—The second period—The reformation in Ireland—Irish fidelity to the ancient faith—Policy of Elizabeth and the Stuarts—Wholesale confiscation and butchery—The men of 1782—The Union—Protestant ascendency—Emancipation, - - - - - - - - - - - 506

XXIX. CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.

Article V.—Italian Society.

Dickens and Kip—Superficial travelers—Writing for money—Lady tourists—License for gossiping—Character of Dickens as a writer—Baretti and Sharp—Italian contentment—Two extremes to be avoided in the social condition—Material comforts—Difference between the Italians and Americans—Laboring classes in Italy—Italian squalor—Mode of life among Italians—Their sprightliness—

Hosted by Google

Vivacity of children—Italians a social people—Their amusements—Gambling—Horse races among them and us compared—Profane swearing—Temperance—General use of wine—Its effects on temperance and health—Politeness—Meekness among the great—Training of children in Italy—A gross charge against Italian morality refuted—The fashion of employing *Cavalieri Serventi*—How it originated, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 523

XXX. CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.

Article VI.—Brazil and the Brazilians.

Interest of the subject—Qualifications for an impartial traveler—Misrepresenting Catholic doctrines and practices—Missionary tourists—Mr. Kidder's misstatements—The Brazilians *adoring* images—Absurd blunders—Fire-works on the "Sabbath"—Service of the holy week—Decoration of Brazilian churches—Religious emblems and names—Our Lady of the Snow—Homicides in Brazil and among us—Distributing tracts—A bright youth—The Bible in Brazil—Extracts from it read in the public schools—"The Bible never proscribed in Brazil"—Inquisitorial censorship—A trick of the Bible society—The Brazilians liberal and tolerant—The Catholic clergy—Slavery in Brazil—Touching practices of piety among the slaves—The religious Brotherhoods—The charity hospital at Rio—Is there any native party in Brazil?—Failure of Mr. Kidder's mission—His return home—Advantages of clerical celibacy, - - - - - - - - - - - - - 538

XXXI. THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES.

Dr. Durbin's Observations in the East.

The present struggle in the East—The ancient Episcopal Sees—Alexandria—Antioch—Jerusalem—Constantinople—Statistics of the eastern and western churches in the early ages—Ancient glory and present degradation of the Oriental Churches—A picture of desolation—A vast necropolis—Decrease of population—Testimonies of Dr Frankland and Dr. Durbin—Number of Christians in the Turkish empire—Chastisement inflicted on the Greek schismatics—Their present forlorn condition—The only hope for their restoration—Their discipline in regard to the celibacy of the clergy—Their acknowledged agreement in doctrine with the Roman Catholics—Argument founded thereon in favor of the Catholic Church—Protestant missionaries in the East—Have they succeeded?—Dr. Durbin's admissions—His omissions supplied in regard to the Protestant missions of Hasbeja and Oroomiah—Disunion among the Protestant missionaries—Catholic missions in the East—Dr. Durbin's candid avowal—Statistics—The seven Apocalyptic churches—The church of Philadelphia—Downright popery—Christian charity recommended, - - - - - - - - - 554

XXXII. ROME,

As seen by a New Yorker.

New York and Rome—Superficial books—Candid avowal—Inaccuracies—Colonnade in front of Saint Peter's—The ball on the dome—St. Mary Major's—Popes preserving ancient monuments—Italian *Ciceroni*—Tricks on travelers—"The lynx-eyed sculptor"—Laughable mistakes—The Jews in Rome—The chair of St. Peter—Religious services in the Colisseum—Rome not sufficiently progressive—Picture of Rome as the capital of Christendom—Artistic genius of Italy—Liberality towards foreign artists—Overbeck—Paintings in churches—Roman churches never closed against worshipers—Roman charity—Beggars—Italian wines—Valuable suggestion—Italian monks—The Vatican—Villa Borghese—Education in Rome—Pope Gregory XVI.—The college of cardinals—General impression made by Rome on our New Yorker, - - - - - - - - - - 570

XXXIII. THE PAPAL GOVERNMENT.

The late Roman revolution—Character of Pius IX—His measures of reform—How received by his subjects—Base ingratitude—Assassination of Rossi and Palma—A reign of terror—Zambianchi and his band of assassins—Mazzini and his idea of liberty—Europe indignant—The Pontiff restored by the Catholic powers—Whose fault was it that Pius IX. did not succeed in effecting political reform?—Monarchy and mob rule—Origin of the papal states—Did the Popes usurp temporal dominion?—Advantages of their being independent sovereigns—Mr. Headley's Outline Sketch—Statistics of the papal territory—The government an elective monarchy—How the administration is conducted—Mr. Headley's mistakes and omissions—Board to redress grievances—The Sacra Consulta—Municipal regulations—Opinion of Lunadoro—The Sacra Ruota—An incident—The advocate of the poor—Charitable and educational institutions cherished by the Papal Government, 585

Hosted by Google

XXXIV. THE PHILADELPHIA RIOTS.

The Native American Party.

Dreadful scenes—Will they occur again?—Signs of the times—*Accident* and *choice*—Fearless Protestant writers—Letter to Mayor Harper—Remote causes of the Riots—Union of hatred—What Catholicity has done for liberty and civilization—And what for this country—Real and nominal freedom—Forecast of Thomas Jefferson—His opinion—Glance at the history of bigotry in the United States—Burning of the Ursuline convent—Rev. Lyman Beecher—And other Protestant ministers—Maria Monk—The Protestant Association—A picture of its spirit and proceedings drawn by a Protestant—Immediate causes of the Riots—Native Americans—"Spare the Bible"—Doings of the party—A slander refuted—True State of the case—*Ex parte* evidence—Attempt to evade responsibility—Agency of the Protestant ministers—Burke's estimate of the Catholic clergy—Address to the Protestant community—And to the Catholics—The Church indestructible, - 596

XXXV. A CHAPTER ON MOBS,

Ancient and Modern.

Can Mobs put down truth and virtue?—Nothing new under the sun—Historical retrospect—Past trials and triumphs of the Church—The first Mob crucified Christ—The second stoned St. Stephen—Mobs during the first three centuries—Nero the first instigator of them—Mobs a principal feature in the early persecutions—How they were gotten up—Persecution of slander—Forgery—Early Christians branded as aliens and traitors—Tertullian's pointed sarcasm—Mob spirit contagious—The great Roman Mob under Diocletian—St. Basil's graphic description—Sepulchral monument to Christianity—Fate of the persecutors—Mobs powerless—The Cross triumphant—Unalterable meekness of early Christians under persecution—Mobs since the reformation—Are they not similar in spirit to those directed against Christianity during the first three centuries?—A parting word to American Catholics, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 619

XXXVI. LAFAYETTE AND PROFESSOR MORSE, - - - - - - 635

XXXVII. COMMON SCHOOLS, - - - - - - - - - - - 652

XXXVIII. THE ASTRONOMICAL CLOCK OF STRASBURG, - - - 685

XXXIX. THE ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF LIBRARIES IN ANCIENT AND MODERN TIMES, - - - - - - - - - - 696

XL. DEMONOLOGY AND THE REFORMATION, - - - - - - 710

XLI. REV. WILLIAM BYRNE, - - - - - - - - - - 729

XLII. THE FEAST OF THE ASSUMPTION, - - - - - - - 736

XLIII. ROME AND BERLIN, - - - - - - - - - - - 749

XLIV. OUR NEW "AMERICAN" LITERATURE, - - - - - - 762

XLV. BENVENUTO CELLINI, - - - - - - - - - - - 772

XLVI. ITALIAN LIFE AND MORALS—EFFECTS OF "ROMANISM" ON SOCIETY, - - - - - - - - - - - - - 788

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google

INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS.

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google

INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS,

To the Impartial Public;

ON THE INTOLERANT SPIRIT OF THE TIMES.

An intolerant spirit invoked against Catholics—Bigotry an implacable monster—The danger of fostering the mob spirit—Features in the present anti-Catholic crusade--Cruel treatment of a Catholic priest—Our adversaries virtually yielding us the victory in fair argument—Their numerous inconsistencies—The Newark outrage—The *manliness* of the American character—Whence danger is to be apprehended to the Republic—The "bats and the eagles"—Hoping for better things—The accusations against us—Is the Catholic Church intolerant?—Or uncharitable?—Latitudinarianism, not charity—Principles of the Church in regard to persecution—Has she ever persecuted as a Church?—Third canon of Lateran—The Inquisition—John Huss—Catholic and Protestant persecution since the reformation—Intolerance in America--Who originated it, and who gave the first example of toleration?—Parallel between Catholic and Protestant countries in the matter of persecution— Are Catholics the enemies of republican government?—What Catholicity and Protestantism have done for human liberty—Charles Carroll of Carrolton—Washington and the Catholics—The temporal power of the Popes—Declarations of Archbishop Carroll and the American Bishops--Letter to the Pope—Are American Catholics a separate community?—Archbishop Carroll and Bishop Dubourg—Foreigners—What they have done for the country—"The foreign vote"—Foreign radicals and infidels—The naturalization laws—The common school system—What the Catholic Church says to her members—Her efforts to promote peace and order—Her charity for all mankind—Archbishop Kenrick's Pastoral.

THAT a fierce spirit of intolerance has been lately evoked in this once free country, no candid observer of passing events will deny. Christians of a particular denomination have been selected, as its first victims; but no one who has studied human nature, as it is developed in the facts of history, will for a moment suppose, that the ruin of Catholics in this country will satisfy the cravings of this fierce Moloch of religious bigotry. As with the tiger, the taste of blood will but sharpen its appetite for new victims. So it has been in the past; so it will be in the future.

Let no one deceive himself, nor suffer himself to be deceived, in a matter of so vital an importance to all who are sheltered under the glorious flag of our union. Once the barriers, which our noble constitution throws around the civil and religious liberties of all citizens alike, are broken down, no matter under what pretext of excitement, of political expediency, or necessity, there is no telling where the spirit of innovation will stop, or where the evils consequent upon it will be arrested. When a torrent has once broken through the embankment along its margin, it spreads devastation through the entire country; and the husbandman who has neglected the necessary precautions, while it was yet time, finds

Hosted by Google

out, when it is too late for remedy, that all the fruits of his patient toil have been swept away or destroyed by the raging waters. So it will be precisely, should the checks and balances, which the wisdom and forecast of our fathers have inserted in the constitution, be neglected or set at naught. The torrent of human passions, once it has overleaped this barrier, will overwhelm our beautiful country with ruins. All our dearly bought liberties will be virtually destroyed; property will be no longer secure; law and order will give place to passion and mob violence; the dearest of all human rights and privileges,—that of worshiping God according to the dictates of our conscience,—will be annihilated; the beautiful earthly paradise of our happy republic will be changed into a frowning wilderness, filled with horror and desolation: finally, anarchy will take the place of order and good government. The worst possible species of tyranny is that of the mob. Far better be oppressed by one tyrant, than be crushed and torn by a thousand: far better have even a Nero or a Diocletian to lord it over you, than be ruled by that hydra-headed monster, called a *mob*. The solitary tyrant may have some misgivings, or retain some remnant of justice or humanity; he may at least be checked by a sense of personal responsibility, and may tremble on his throne at the fear of popular retribution: the many-headed despot has neither reason, nor justice, nor humanity, nor conscience, nor fear of God or man, to restrain him from deeds of violence.

For the truth of this picture, we appeal with confidence to all history; from the period when an excited mob cried out against the Blessed Jesus at the tribunal of Pilate:—Crucify Him! crucify Him!!—down to the other day, when another mob, composed of persons calling themselves *Christians*, raised fiendish shouts of triumph at the tearing down and trampling under foot of the Cross, which had ornamented the spire of a Catholic Church in Chelsea! At every time and in every place, the mob has always been the same ruthless, savage, untameable monster; the Christian scarcely less so than the pagan.[1]

Unhappily, we need not go far back into times past, nor travel far from home, to witness the sad effects of mob violence. A distinctive feature in the present crusade against Catholics in this country, is precisely the invoking against them of this ruthless spirit. Five or six of our churches either burnt, or sacked, or blown up by gunpowder,—most of them while our citizens were engaged in the joyous celebration of the liberty-hallowed Fourth of July;—street brawlers, generally

1 For more on this subject, we refer to the Chapter on Mobs, in this Volume, p. 619, seqq., and to the Article on the Philadelphia Riots, p. 596, seqq.

Hosted by Google

men of the lowest and most infamous character, hired to vilify and slander us and all that we hold most dear and sacred in the public streets and highways, thereby openly exciting the passions of the ignorant to bloody civil feuds; our people, after having been thus grievously wronged in their character as citizens and as religionists, butchered in brutal street encounters, or assassinated in detail,[1] and then almost invariably placed in the wrong by a mendacious press and telegraph, in the interest of their enemies; and the victims of all these cruel and accumulated wrongs generally receiving, instead of sympathy, but additional obloquy and persecution, they being in almost every instance the only ones arrested and punished for the riots which others had caused, while the murderers and assassins and church burners escape: — these are some of the practical workings of that truculent spirit, which, during the present year, has been aroused against us in this *free* country!

Every one knows how a Catholic priest — the Rev. Mr. Bapst — was lately treated by a savage mob at Ellsworth in Maine. He was universally conceded to be a man of great zeal and benevolence, as well as of irreproachable life. The only crime alleged against him, was that he had dared express an opinion on the Common School System, different from that of the majority. For this, in pursuance of a resolution passed at a town meeting, he was tarred and feathered, ridden on a rail, and treated with indignities, which forcibly remind us of the scenes on Calvary; indignities of which savages should have been ashamed. The ruffians, amidst these horrible outrages to God's minister, did not, however, forget to rifle his pockets and to appropriate to themselves his watch and money![2] Says the Bangor Journal — a secular print of the vicinity:

"While the tarring and feathering was going on, he was mocked and reviled with horrid blasphemies and indecencies. He was asked why he came over to this country. To preach the Catholic doctrine, he replied. We are Protestants, the ruffians said, and will teach you better than that. One, mocking him, said scornfully: "So they persecuted Jesus of old." Another, reviling, asked "Will the Virgin Mary save you?" These blasphemies remind one of the mockings on Calvary. Some asked him how many wives he had, how many children, &c. These are the most decent of the insults, and are all that admit of publication."

Do we live in the nineteenth century, or have we been transported back to the period of civil commotions in the middle ages; when modern society was struggling into form, when feudal strife filled Europe with bloody intestine feuds, and when Guelph and Ghibelline caused the streets of Florence and Milan to run in blood? Do we live in a land of

1 Witness the assassination of poor McCarthy at Newark; and other murders mentioned in the public prints.

2 Something more than fifty dollars

Hosted by Google

liberty and law, or in one of tyranny and anarchy? Has our noble constitution — the master work of human wisdom — become a dead letter; or what is worse, have its just and equitable provisions, securing equal civil and religious freedom to all, been openly contemned and trampled under foot? Have our people forgotten the price of liberty, that they now hold it so cheap? What will the friends of monarchy and the enemies of republicanism in the old world think and say, as they point in triumph to these sad commentaries, which we have written with our own hands, on our boasted fundamental principle of equal law and equal privileges to all? What will the radical republicans of Europe, with whom so many of our people profess to sympathize, answer, when their opponents will appeal to such practical workings of liberty as the above, in the great Model Republic across the Atlantic? Can any reasonable man doubt, that the excesses to which we allude will have the effect of greatly weakening, if not of wholly marring the cause of true and rational liberty throughout the world?

If history utters any warning, or teaches any lesson, it is this great truth: that persecution has never yet put down a good cause, nor materially served a bad one. Truth may be obscured or smothered for a time; it cannot be destroyed. Thus the sun may be darkened for a time by the interposing cloud, but anon his bright rays will break out again to illumine the world; no human power can wholly extinguish his light, much less blot him out from the heavens. Yet the sun will share the fate of all things created, and cease to exist; but the truth of God abideth forever. For more than eighteen centuries the Catholic Church has stood, a tower of strength, amidst the ruins of all things earthly, strewn in her pathway. Dynasties have changed, thrones have fallen, and sceptres have been broken around her; yet has she stood, and she stil' stands, stronger than ever:

"She saw the commencement of all the governments and of all the ecclesiastical establishments, that now exist in the world; and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. . . Four times since the Church of Rome was established in western Christendom has the human intellect risen up against her yoke. Twice she remained completely victorious. Twice she came forth from the conflict bearing the marks of cruel wounds, but with the principle of life still strong within her. When we reflect upon the tremendous assaults which she has survived, we find it difficult to conceive in what way she is to perish."[1]

Nothing could, in fact, be more honorable to the Catholic Church than the mode of warfare which has been lately adopted to effect her ruin in this country. In appealing to passion and mob violence against her, her

1 Macaulay — Review of Ranke's History of the Popes.

Hosted by Google

enemies virtually acknowledge that calm examination and sober reasoning are powerless for her destruction; by the necessity under which they find themselves to resort to misrepresentation and slander, they substantially concede that they would be worsted in the fair field of truthful statement and dispassionate argument. Thus, those Protestants who have been induced by prejudice and passion to favor this unhallowed mode of attack upon our Church, have really abandoned the vantage-ground in the controversy, and have thereby unwittingly yielded us the victory. Bad temper, unfairness, and violence in a disputant, greatly damage his cause, in the judgment of all calm and impartial men; while the party assailed by such weapons is always sure to win sympathy, and to gain on public opinion.

Another feature in the present violent warfare against us, is its glaring inconsistency. The men who are most prominent in the crusade are, in general, as unprincipled as the means they employ are detestable.[1] Professing to be the champions of freedom, their secret and even avowed object is to rob of freedom a large portion of their fellow citizens: — for their "war to the hilt against Romanism," as explained by their words and their *actions*, means nothing less than this. Professing to love the Bible, and boasting a wish to see the principles of the Bible triumphantly carried out in politics, they trample recklessly upon the most cherished principles of the Bible. The Bible says: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" they say, we must hate our neighbor, and declare war to the hilt against him, if he happen to belong to the oldest and most numerous body of Christians on the face of the earth. The Bible teaches, that we must love our enemies; they hate even their friends, or those at least who have never wronged them in thought or deed. The Bible inculcates the equitable principle, that we must do unto others, as we would wish others to do unto us under like circumstances; they teach that Catholics are to be excluded from the operation of this Gospel rule. The Bible teaches, that we are to be kind and indulgent to the poor stranger who comes within our borders; they teach that no treatment is too hard for the stranger, if he dare think for himself in matters of religion, and exercise his undoubted civil rights — clearly guaranteed to him by the constitution in the country of his adoption. These specifications will suffice to show, how our boasted lovers and champions of the Bible,— who are wont to parade the sacred volume in their riotous and bloody proces-

1 We speak here and throughout this Address chiefly of the leaders in the anti-Catholic warfare. We are convinced that very many among those who have enrolled themselves in the new political party are well meaning men, who have been misled by the arts of others, or who are even persuaded that they are doing God and their country service by proscribing Catholics!

Hosted by Google

sions,[1] — wantonly trample it under foot, whenever its declarations conflict with their headlong passions.

Another glaring inconsistency in those who are foremost in the anti-Catholic crusade, is found in the fact, that while they profess to advocate a change of policy in regard to all foreigners who come to our shores, they secretly, and sometimes even openly, fraternize with the blood-stained Irish Orangemen and the truculent German infidels! Their boasted political principles are thus lost sight of, or openly violated, whenever there is a good opportunity for waging a "war to the hilt against Romanism." Every one is familiar with the late atrocious attack on the Catholic Church at Newark by Irish Orangemen, and how the press in the interest of the Know Nothings, as usual, added slander to outrage, by laying all the blame on the Irish Catholics. Well, sacrilege was perpetrated in the open light of day; murder was done on the person of an inoffensive man: yet up to the present day not one among the foreign Protestant perpetrators of these horrid deeds has been even arrested! Still the truth came out, after the first storm of passion had passed away; and even the New York Tribune, re-echoing the declaration of other papers, at length honorably proclaimed it as follows:

THE NEWARK MURDER AND SACRILEGE.— "That Church stands fairly exculpated from all offense, and its devastation is an unprovoked and shameful outrage, which reflects great discredit on Newark and belligerent Protestantism. And it is worthy of note that while this is the fifth or sixth Catholic edifice, which has been destroyed or devastated by mob violence in our country, *there is no instance on record wherein a Protestant house of worship has been ravaged by Catholics.*"[2]

As if conscious of the dishonorable character of their warfare on Catholics, the new anti-Catholic party enters the field shrouded in secresy and wrapped up in mystery. Professing to be the champions of "American principles," they skulk away into darkness, and seem ashamed to show their faces in the light of day. If this be one of the "American principles," then are we done forever with American principles! Born and reared up in this free country, we have doated from our infancy on the glorious principles embodied in our noble declaration of independence, and in those cognate ones set forth in our matchless constitution. They have been the dream of our youth, and the idol of our maturer years. And we have had abundant opportunities to know, that those whom *choice*, and not the mere *accident* of birth, have made citizens of our happy country, have, without an exception known to us, entertained a fond predilection for American principles, scarcely surpassed in intensity

1 As they did during the Philadelphia Riots. 2 New York Tribune, of September 8, 1854

Hosted by Google

by our own. But we and they had thought, in our simplicity, that *manliness* was one among those cherished "American principles": that it was even an essential part of the American character to be open, candid, and straight-forward in all its acts; that the American could have no possible cause to be ashamed either of his name, of his political doctrines, or of his acts; that he needed no cover of darkness to conceal either his purposes or his deeds. But we were mistaken; our dream has been dissipated; and we awake to the painful reality, that neither we nor our fathers knew anything about "American principles," until we were happily taught them by foreign infidels, incendiaries, and assassins, boasting the hallowed name of patriots and martyrs of liberty! Yet these were the very men against whose pernicious arts Washington had so solemnly warned us, when he bade us beware of foreign influence! The real danger to our republican institutions lies in the encouragement given to those mischievous men — the spawn of foreign revolutions — whom failure in their attempts abroad causes to be cast upon our shores. Received with open arms by our patriotic sympathy, they proceed forthwith to organize amongst us those dangerous secret political societies, which were the chief instruments of their warfare in Europe. Hear what the venerable Josiah Quincy says of such societies:

"The liberties of a people are never more certainly in the path of destruction, than when they trust themselves to the guidance of secret societies. Birds of the night are never birds of wisdom. One of them indeed received this name, but it was from its *looks*, and not from its moral and intellectual qualities. They are for the most part birds of prey. The fate of a republic is sealed when the Bats take the lead of the Eagles."

Every reader of American history knows how Washington saved the country, by refusing to recognize Genet, the envoy of the bloody French republic; whose arts and influence among the people had well nigh brought ruin on our infant government. The calm judgment and wise forecast of Washington prevented us from being led away by this most dangerous "foreign influence;" leading to precisely such "entangling alliances," as the demagogue Kossuth, at a more recent period, sought, happily in vain, to bring about.

But enough on this branch of the subject. We cannot bring ourselves to believe, for a moment, that the narrow-minded, inconsistent, unscriptural, un-American, and utterly detestable spirit, exhibited by those among us who now take a leading part in the warfare against Catholics, is at all likely to become the settled policy of our yet happy and prosperous country. Should we, however, be wrong in this belief, and should that

Hosted by Google

truculent spirit prevail for a time over sounder and more American principles; should the persecution of Catholics continue and increase until our churches will all be in ruins, and there will remain no resting place for our feet on the soil of this republic; then are we convinced, that amidst the ruins of our Church in this country will be strewn likewise the ruins of the republic itself! The liberal and enlarged principles of the latter will be annihilated; its greatness will be arrested and its glories dimmed; and while the stars of its flag may yet float in the heavens, its E PLURIBUS UNUM will be obliterated, and its many colored stripes, emblematic of union in diversity — like its motto — will be blotted out forever.[1]

Still we are unshaken in our hope of better things in the future. There is, after all, a strongly conservative spirit and a practical good sense in the mass of our population, which needs only be fairly awakened, to frown down all attempts at fastening on our necks the system of narrow-minded and proscriptive policy of which we are speaking. To this practical sense and "sober second thought" alone do we now address ourselves; all reasoning with the unscrupulous faction which seeks to abridge or destroy our liberties, were worse than useless. We will accordingly devote the remaining portion of this Address to answering some principal objections made against us by our more reasonable opponents. Fully to refute them all, would require a volume; though the bulk of the charges might be answered, by simply saying that we are misrepresented. We will confine ourselves to those which affect our character as citizens:[2] and even here, we must be brief, though we hope that what we shall be able to say will be plain, straightforward, and to the purpose. Truth needs no gloss nor drapery; when presented in its simple and unadorned beauty, it best attracts the admiration, and wins the homage of all its candid and impartial votaries.

Almost all the accusations made against us are reducible to these two heads: first, that in religion we are intolerant and proscriptive; second, that in politics, we are enemies of republican institutions, and friends of a foreign despotism. We will proceed summarily to answer these two charges, together with some of the principal specifications alleged to support them. But as we cannot be reasonably expected in this Introductory Address to go into all the details necessary for the full

1 Or if not wholly obliterated, at least severed from the unity of the Flag: the *stars* being for the native born, and the *stripes* for the foreigner, escaping from tyranny to this noble asylum of freedom! This is the beautiful thought of Archbishop Hughes.

2 In the following Pages, we answer many of the most current popular charges against the Church; particularly in the Theological Essays, Part ii, p. 397, seqq.

Hosted by Google

elucidation of a subject so vast in the topics which it must necessarily embrace, we shall claim the privilege of referring, as we proceed, to the Essays contained in this volume for such additional facts and illustrations as they may supply, on the points which will successively come under discussion.

I. In regard to the charge of exclusiveness and intolerance, two things, which are often confounded, should be accurately distinguished: namely, *theological* exclusiveness and *civil* intolerance. Our Protestant brethren have, in general, very vague and loose ideas upon this subject. Among them, the term *religious liberality* generally implies what might with more propriety be called *latitudinarianism*. The fashionable theory, which now obtains extensively among those outside of the Catholic Church, holds that it matters not what a Christian believes, provided he try to be a moral man and a good citizen; in other words, that Christ either taught no specific doctrines whatever, or that He required, as a condition of salvation, belief in none which He did teach, or at most in but a few fundamental articles. When those, who maintain the obligation of belief in these fundamental principles only, are called upon to define them, they are often embarrassed for an answer; some giving a wider, some a more limited range to the points in question. All, however, agree in advocating, to a greater or less extent, the latitudinarian principle above indicated.

Now we Catholics strongly protest against this popular theory, as tending to unsettle all faith, and to subvert Christianity itself. We hold that Christ delivered a definite system of religion; that *all* the doctrines which He taught are equally true, and equally to be believed; that He died on the cross to seal the truth of them all with His blood; and that consequently all the articles of faith which he established, in a manner so solemn, must be believed by all who have the means of knowing them. In other words, we hold that Christ, being the Son of God and Truth itself, did establish, and in the very nature of things, could have established, but ONE RELIGION; and that, as He founded it for the salvation of mankind, He must have required that it should be embraced, in all its parts, by all who would be saved. This principle we regard as almost self-evident; and we cannot see how it can be denied by any, who have definite ideas on the nature and purpose of the Christian religion, or who believe in the divinity of its Author and Founder. If the Christian religion was not, after all, necessary to salvation, then why did the Son of God undergo so much labor, and endure so much obloquy and

Hosted by Google

suffering for its establishment? Why did He say, speaking of all the doctrines which He had taught without any distinction: "He that believeth not, shall be condemned?" [1] Why does His inspired apostle Paul declare, in the name of his Master,— "Without faith it is impossible to please God!" [2]

But our present purpose does not require us to discuss this or any other doctrinal point; we are merely stating our belief. What then do we hold in regard to those who are outside of the one true Church of Christ? Do we condemn them all alike and indiscriminately? We do not. We leave them to their own responsibility before God, by whose unerring judgment they will, like ourselves, stand or fall. If not united with the Church, *through their own fault,*— having the light and opportunity to find out what it is, and neglecting to correspond therewith,— they are in imminent danger of losing their immortal souls, for which Jesus died. If they are separated from it, *without any fault of theirs,*— should there be any such,— they will not be condemned *for this;* for God condemns none but the guilty. Whether they are out of the true church with or without their own fault, the great Searcher of hearts alone can decide; and in His hands we leave them.

But the Catholic Church teaches farther, with Christ Himself, that we must "love our neighbor as ourselves;" that we must bear the burdens of one another; that we must pray for and love even our enemies, and do good to those who do evil to us; that, when it is question of solacing misery or succoring distress, we must not stop to inquire the belief of the sufferer: in a word, that without charity towards *all* mankind, the profession of Christianity were vain and profitless. The Catholic Church enjoins upon her children to be just in all their dealings, to be good citizens, to be good neighbors, to be good parents, good children, good husbands, good wives; — good in every relation of society; but especially, to be good Christians, loving God above all things, and performing all their actions for His honor and glory.

If these principles be intolerant, then must we plead guilty to the charge. But if they be such as are essentially connected with Christianity itself, such as alone are true and consistent with the whole tenor and the very end and aim of the Christian religion; then are we content to bear whatever of obloquy may attach to our belief in them. If, to be considered charitable, we are called upon to sacrifice truth and common sense itself, and to say that a hundred contradictory systems of belief may all be equally

1 St. Mark xvi. 2 Hebrews xi.

Hosted by Google

true, then must we submit to the imputation of uncharitableness. In this we do but imitate St. Paul, who sought not to please men, but rather to be the servant of Christ;[1] and we do but share in the ignominy of Christ Himself, who, instead of flattering human error, died for the truth.

But does the Catholic Church "call down fire from heaven" on the heads of those who dissent from her belief? By no means: hers has been at all times a different spirit altogether, and one more consonant with that of her divine Founder. Her mission has been to win sinners to repentance, to inculcate mercy and love, not hatred and bitterness. The first laws for the punishment of heretics were enacted by the early Christian emperors, not by the Popes, the bishops, or the Church. The latter deprecated all rigor against the sectaries, unless in particular cases, where it seemed indispensable to restrain violence, or to redress open and glaring outrages against religious liberty.[2] The Catholic bishops and the Popes were themselves often the victims of imperial claims to regulate the affairs of the Church; and it is very doubtful whether they could have prevented the enactment and execution of the laws in question. The Popes were always opposed to violent measures for the propagation of the faith among pagans; and they were also in the habit of throwing the shield of their protection around the Jews, whenever their religious privileges and civil rights were infringed by intemperate Christian zeal.[3] The Church has thus always adopted and acted upon the maxim of Tertullian, who, more than sixteen centuries ago, claimed religious liberty for Christians as an indefeasable right, growing out of the very nature of religion itself: "RELIGIONIS NON EST RELIGIONEM COGERE — IT IS NOT THE PART OF RELIGION TO ESTABLISH RELIGION BY FORCE."[4] Her spirit of mildness was breathed forth by the great St. Augustine, when, writing to Donatus, the imperial Proconsul in Africa, he deprecated all undue severity against the Arians and Donatists, and said: "We desire them to be *corrected, not slain.*"[5] As one of her greatest Popes, St. Leo the Great, says: "The lenity of the Church being content with the priestly sentence, shrinks from sanguinary vengeance;"[6] and she sanctions or tolerates severe measures emanating from the princes of the earth, only when, without them, society

1 "Do I seek to please men! If I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ."— *Galatians* i, 10.

2 See the evidence on this subject, presented in considerable detail by Archbishop Kenrick, in his work on the Primacy; Part ii. chap. viii.

3 For many facts sustaining this assertion, see "The Primacy," ibid.

4 The whole passage of Tertullian, as translated by Archbishop Kenrick, is as follows: "It is man's right and privilege, that each one should worship what he thinks proper; nor can the religion of another injure or profit him. Neither is it a part of religion to compel its adoption; since this should be spontaneous, not forced, as even sacrifices are asked only of the cheerful giver." Primacy, ibid.

5 Epist. Donato.

6 Epist. ad Turribium.

Hosted by Google

itself would be endangered, "all regard for probity destroyed, all bonds of society dissolved, and divine and human laws at once overturned."[1] Hence that celebrated and well known maxim, embodied as an axiom in her Canon Law: "ECCLESIA ABHORRET A SANGUINE—THE CHURCH ABHORS BLOODSHED." So far is this principle carried, that a standing rule of her discipline forbids the ordination, not only of those who have been guilty of shedding blood, but also of those who, whether as judges, accusers, or voluntary witnesses, have co-operated towards passing a sentence of death on a fellow man, or even one of bodily mutilation without taking life.[2] From the earliest period of her history, she has taught and acted upon these principles. To furnish one out of a hundred examples of this, it is well known that in the fourth century, St. Martin, the illustrious bishop of Tours, openly censured two Spanish bishops — Ithacius and Idacius — for teaching that the Priscillianists should be punished with corporal chastisement or death for their wicked heresy, though this tended to the subversion of social order itself; and the Church sustained him in his truly Christian course.[3]

Persecution is not, and never has been a doctrine of the Catholic Church. Our standard writers have often boldly defied their adversaries to establish the contrary proposition; but their challenge has never been fairly met. Surely, if the Catholic Church had ever taught persecution, as a doctrine, her enemies could tell us when and where she inculcated the offensive tenet. If she ever persecuted, *as a Church*, they could certainly furnish us with such facts and specifications on the subject, as would not be susceptible of either explanation or reply. The Catholic Church is no secret society; she has taught boldly, and acted out her teaching openly in the arena of the world for more than eighteen centuries; and if the charge of persecution could be sustained against her, it would long since have been done. The attempt has indeed been made, but it has utterly failed. Our writers have scattered to the winds the arguments of their opponents on this subject, and have shown that, in the majority of cases, the latter have substituted vague declamation for *facts*, fiery appeals to passion for sober argument.

But have not Catholics persecuted in times past? We do not deny it; but we answer, that they did so in virtue of no doctrine of their Church. If the mere act of persecution proved the doctrine, then it would follow that all the Protestant sects hold the same odious tenet; for all of them

1 Ibid. He refers to the fatal errors of the ancient Manicheans.

2 See our Canonists—*passim*.

3 The great St Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, united with St. Martin in this charitable interposition in favor of the persecuted Priscillianists

Hosted by Google

have been stained with persecution, at one period or other of their history. They have all persecuted Catholics, whenever and wherever they had the power to do so; and almost all of them have likewise been guilty of the glaring inconsistency of persecuting brother Protestants, for daring, in the exercise of the conceded right of private judgment, to think differently from themselves! But who would infer from this undoubted fact, that Protestants generally hold it as a *doctrine*, that all who dissent from their particular views should be put down by fire and sword? Such a conclusion would be clearly illogical and grievously unjust. Now we claim the application of the same equitable principle to the charge of persecution brought against our Church; and surely our claim is not unreasonable.

But the Catholic Church professes to be infallible and unchangeable, whereas the Protestant sects admit that they are liable to err, and have often erred in times past. We freely grant the latter proposition; in regard to the former, our adversaries lose sight of a very obvious distinction, which truth demands should be made. The Catholic Church is unchangeable in *doctrine*, but not in *discipline*. The latter may and does vary in its details, according to times, places, and circumstances. So that, even if our opponents should prove that our Church had, at any period of her history, adopted persecution as a line of conduct under particular circumstances, or as a general *discipline*, they would not still make good their position. But have they established even this proposition? We believe not; and to show how inconclusive are their arguments, on a point which does not directly touch the real matter at issue, we will briefly refer to a few of their specifications.

They allege, with an air of triumph, the third Canon of the fourth Council of Lateran,[1] which excommunicated heretics, and ordered that they should be delivered up for punishment to the secular power. Our answer is obvious. In the first place, it is manifest that no *doctrine* is promulgated by this canon, but that only a rule of action is laid down for a particular case. 2. We may observe, that Mathew Paris, a weighty cotemporary historian, denies that this and the other canons were the acts of the council itself;[2] and that the English Protestant church historian, Collier, declares his belief that the third canon in particular is not genuine.[3] 3. But, waiving this, and admitting the genuineness of the canon, every reader of Church History knows that it was enacted with the full concurrence, and probably on the positive demand, of the

1 Held A. D. 1215.
2 Math. Paris — ad annum 1215, apud Milner — Letters to a Prebendary.
3 Collier, Ecclesiastical History; vol. i, p. 424: quoted ibid.

Hosted by Google

temporal sovereigns of Christendom, who were nearly all of them present at the council, either personally, or by their ambassadors.[1] Some of the provisions of the canon could not, in fact, have been enacted, much less, carried into execution, but with the consent and co-operation of the temporal sovereigns; especially of those who were chiefly concerned. It may here be remarked, in general, that many of the councils held during the middle ages were not exclusively ecclesiastical conventions, but rather congresses of all Christendom, representing the temporal as well as the spiritual power.[2] 4. The severe provisions of this canon were directed against the Albigenses, who then infested the south of France, than whom a more pestilent sect probably never existed. They were the sworn foes of all religion, of all decency, and of all social order. Wherever they appeared, desolation and ruin followed in their pathway.[3] They were the Jacobins and *Sans-culottes* of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; and they were, if possible, even more truculent and bloody than the Jacobins themselves. They were the enemies of both God and man. Worse than our modern Mormons, they condemned marriage altogether, and gave a free rein to every brutal passion and appetite. Had they succeeded in establishing their principles, all order and all civilization would have been at an end. Is it any wonder then, that all Christendom — the State no less than the Church — rose up in mass to put down, even by force, a sect so monstrous? Is it not plain also, that, such being the facts, the severe measures sanctioned by the council constitute an exceptional case, which should not be alleged as evidence of a general rule? And for the truth of this picture, we appeal with confidence to all cotemporary history. We may safely apply to them what the learned Protestant church historian Mosheim candidly says of a cognate sect — the Brethren of the Free Spirit:[4]

"Certain writers, who have accustomed themselves to entertain a high idea of the sanctity of all those who, in the middle ages, separated themselves from the Church of Rome, suspect the inquisitors of having falsely attributed impious doctrines to the Brethren of the Free Spirit.

1 There were thus present at this council the emperors of Germany and Constantinople, the kings of France, England, Aragon, Sicily, Hungary, Jerusalem, and Cyprus; besides several minor sovereigns.

2 As during the period in question, society was struggling into form, and there were no standing armies to repel strongly organized and wide-spread aggressions upon social order, expeditions of a general character for the defense of society were decided on in councils of the European sovereigns, and when the enemies of order were likewise the foes of religion, these expeditions were called crusades.

3 For facts and details on this subject, we beg to refer to "The Primacy," by Archbishop Kenrick, sup. cit.

4 During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries a great part of Europe was infested with pernicious sects, which revived under different forms the anti-social errors of the ancient Maincheans. They were all alike, though they bore the different names of Turlupins, Begards, Brethren of the Free Spirit, and Albigenses. The Petro-Brusians were a kindred sect.

Hosted by Google

But this suspicion is entirely *groundless*, &c. . . . Their shocking violation of decency was a consequence of their pernicious system. They looked upon decency and modesty as marks of inward corruption. . . . Certain enthusiasts amongst them maintained, that the believer could not sin, let his conduct be ever so horrible or atrocious." [1]

But what have we to say on the Inquisition, especially the Spanish Inquisition; which, with the alleged sanction of the Church, filled Christendom with so many horrors for ages? What explanation are we to give of what occurred at the Council of Constance, which, contrary to plighted faith, consigned John Huss and Jerome of Prague to the flames? Satisfactory answers on both these points could be easily given; and they have been given a hundred times already. But as we devote special Essays to these subjects in the following pages, [2] we must refer the candid reader to them for details; and we do so with entire confidence, that all who will take the trouble to read these papers, will rise from the perusal with the conviction, that even those darker passages in the Church's history do not make out the case of persecution against her, even as a point of discipline.

Come we now to times nearer our own day. What are the statistics of persecution during the last three centuries, since the dawn of what has been called by its friends the *reformation?* And how stands the case at present in Europe, and *in America?* No candid man who has read history aright will deny, that during this period, and especially at present, we have been, and are now, much more sinned against than sinning in the matter of persecution. Catholics who speak the English language, in particular, have been for three hundred years, almost without intermission, the victims of the most ruthless intolerance. Robbed of their church and often of their personal property; slandered in their reputation; hunted down by the myrmidons of a persecuting government; branded as traitors and outlaws in their own country and that of their fathers before them: such has been their treatment in Protestant England up to a comparatively recent period; ever since the fatal day when the tyrant Henry VIII.— the Nero of modern times — quarreled with the Pope, and violently severed the unity of the Church, because she could not and would not sanction his headlong passions, to the injury of a virtuous wife! [3] In Ireland, the fate of the Catholics was still harder, and of longer continuance. [4]

1 Eccles. History, vol. iii, p. 284; Maclain's translation — quoted by Milner.

2 See the Articles on the Spanish Inquisition, and on John Huss and the Hussites; pp. 213, 191 seqq.

3 See the third Article on Church History p. 57 seqq, for farther details on the reformation in England

4 In the Article on Ireland and the Irish — p. 506 seqq., we have sketched the sufferings of Catholics Ireland under English persecution.

Hosted by Google

We go even farther, and state, as a fact which no one will deny, who retains the least regard for historic truth, that in every country in Europe where the reformation succeeded, Catholics were invariably persecuted, almost as atrociously and for nearly as long a time, as in England and Ireland. Robbery, sacrilege, slander, civil commotions and bloodshed, were everywhere the arms with which incipient Protestantism assailed those, whose only crime was their honest wish to adhere to the faith, and worship at the altars of their forefathers, and of the forefathers of those very men too who were engaged in persecuting them! Perhaps in Switzerland, an old Catholic republic with some remains of the ancient Catholic freedom, the persecuting spirit was less rampant than elsewhere; but even in Switzerland, with its glowing Catholic memories of William Tell, Furst, and Melchtal, we find no exception to the remark just made. Even there the fiercely intolerant spirit of the early reformers was not softened. This we establish, by abundant evidence, in a special Essay on the Reformation in Switzerland.[1]

We conclude this branch of the subject with an extract from the Edinburg Review —an unexceptionable Protestant authority— which candidly places in its true light the character of the self-styled reformers, in the matter of persecution:[2]

"Protestant writers, in general, are apt to describe the reformation as a struggle for religious freedom. . . . Now, we humbly apprehend, that the free exercise of private judgment was most heartily abhorred by the first reformers, except only where the persons who assumed it had the good fortune to be exactly of their opinion. . . . . The martyrdoms of Servetus, in Geneva, and of Joan Bocher, in England, are notable instances of the religious freedom which prevailed in the pure and primitive state of the Protestant churches. It is obvious, also, that the freedom for which our first reformers so strenuously contended, did not, by any means, include a freedom to think as the Catholics thought; that is to say, to think as all Europe had thought for many ages, and as the greatest part of Europe thought at the very time and continue to think to this very day. *The complete extirpation of the Catholic Church, not merely as a public establishment, but as a tolerated sect, was the avowed object of our first reformers.* In 1560, by an act of the parliament, which established the reformation in Scotland, both the sayers and hearers of Mass, whether in public or in private, were, for the first offense, to suffer confiscation of all their goods, together with corporal punishment, at the discretion of the magistrate; they were to be punished by banishment for the second offense; and *by death* for the third! . . . . It was not possible for the most bigoted Catholic to inculcate more distinctly the complete extirpation of the opinions and worship of the Protestants, than John Knox inculcated as a most sacred duty, incumbent on the civil government in the first instance, and if the civil government is remiss, incumbent

1 Page 234, seqq.

2 For the intolerant character of the early English reformers, see Article III, on Church History 57 seqq. where we give Macaulay's portrait of Cranmer.

Hosted by Google

on the people, to extirpate completely the opinions and worship of the Catholics. and even to massacre the Catholics, man, woman, and child. . . . . If the government had followed the directions of the clergy, the Catholics would have been extirpated by the sword. . . . In the reigns of Charles the Second, and of his brother, a Protestant prelacy, in alliance with a Protestant administration, outstript the wishes of those arbitrary monarchs in the persecution of their Protestant countrymen. It is needless to weary ourselves or our readers with disgusting details, which the curious in martyrology may find in various publications. Everybody knows that the martyrdoms were both numerous and cruel, but perhaps the comparative mildness of the *Catholic* Church of Scotland, is not so generally known. Knox has investigated the matter with commendable diligence, but has not been able to muster more than eighteen martyrs who perished by the hand of the executioner, from the year 1500, when heresy first began, till 1559, when the Catholics had no longer the power to persecute. . . . It is, indeed, a horrid list; but far short of the numbers, who, during the twenty-two years immediately previous to the Revolution, were capitally executed in Scotland for the '*wicked error*' of separation from the worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church."[1]

While we heartily unite with every lover of freedom in condemning all acts of persecution for conscience sake, or for religious opinions not subversive of morality or the public safety, candor will compel even our adversaries to acknowledge, that in the persecution of Catholics by Protestants, there were aggravating circumstances, which were not found in the persecution of the latter by the former. Protestant persecution was purely aggressive; Catholic persecution was mainly defensive: the former sought to rob Catholics of all they held most dear; the latter was directed chiefly towards maintaining the most undoubted and most sacred rights. Catholics were in possession; Protestants aimed at violently ousting them from their firesides and their altars, and taking their place. Catholics sought to preserve the ancient faith and worship, hallowed and rendered dear by a thousand glorious memories; Protestants sought to substitute for it, frequently by violence, new doctrines and new forms, about which they were not themselves agreed, and which they claimed the right of changing as often as they might judge proper.

Waiving all this, however, let us strike evenly the balance of persecution in the past; burying whatever is unpleasant in generous oblivion, and forgiving as we hope to be forgiven. Now, how stands the account of religious persecution at the present day? Is all the intolerance on the side of Catholics? Or have not Protestants at least their own full share of the guilt, which they are so free to charge exclusively on others? Let us see.

The impartial comparison between Catholic and Protestant countries, on

1 Edinburgh Review, Article VIII., entitled "Toleration of the Reformers," No. 53.

Hosted by Google

the subject of persecution in late years, exhibits a fearful balance against the latter. It may be stated without exaggeration, that there is scarcely a Protestant country on the face of the earth, which does not even at this enlightened day, persecute Catholics, in one form or another, or which has not persecuted them during the present century; while there is, on the contrary, scarcely a Catholic nation in the world, which does persecute, or has recently persecuted Protestants. Strange as this may sound in the ears of those who have been misled into the persuasion, that the Catholic is essentially a persecuting Church, and that we owe religious freedom entirely to Protestantism, it is nevertheless true. Here are the facts; and first on the Catholic side.

France is Catholic, and France not only grants the fullest liberty of worship to her small number of Protestant citizens, but she even pays their ministers out of the public treasury. Austria is Catholic; and Austria, despotic though she be usually represented, concedes a full measure of religious liberty to the Protestant minority, allowing them even to have their own separate schools, supported, like those of the Catholic majority, from the common fund.[1] Bavaria is Catholic, and Bavaria also allows equal civil and religious privileges to her Protestant subjects. Belgium is Catholic, and Belgium has a fundamental law, granting unrestricted and equal religious freedom to all. Italy, Spain, and Portugal, with perhaps some of the colonies of the two last, may be thought to form exceptions to this general rule; but though their policy be somewhat proscriptive on the score of religion, we read of no acts of persecution, worthy the name, having been recently perpetrated therein. In the first place, they evidently could not have been guilty of persecuting their Protestant citizens, for the very simple reason that they have no Protestant citizens. If they are jealous, especially of English Protestants, who sometimes pass through those countries, distributing tracts and Bibles, it has generally happened, because England has rendered herself justly odious on the continent of Europe by her constant political intrigues among her neighbors, often carried on under the guise of religious zeal; and because her tract distributers are suspected, frequently with too much reason, of being political propagandists, and secret agents paid for their services.

The intrigues of Lord Minto in Italy, and those of Bulwer and others in Spain, are too well known to require proof. One of the principal means employed by the hired agents of these men for strengthening English influence, was the distribution of Bibles and tracts, and the accompanying

1 The authority for this statement will be given a little farther on.

Hosted by Google

efforts to make proselytes among the Catholic inhabitants. The intrigue, however, was unsuccessful; Bulwer was compelled to leave Spain, and Minto is now detested in Italy as never was man detested before. The affair of the Madiai, about which so great an outcry was lately made, may be easily explained in this way. Their imprisonment was the result of their active attempts at proselytism, as *paid* emissaries of England; not of their wish to profess and practise religious principles opposed to those of the Catholic majority. It is a notorious fact, that in both Italy and Spain, Protestant travelers or temporary residents are never molested on account of peculiarities in their religious creed or worship; provided they, on their side, do not interfere with the faith and worship of the Catholic population. The Anglican church and our American Protestants have places of worship at Rome itself, under the eyes and with the permission of the Pope; who not only allows them to assemble therein for religious purposes as often as they wish, but protects them in the enjoyment of their religious freedom. Protestants have similar religious privileges in Tuscany, and elsewhere in Italy. At Rome, at Florence, at Leghorn, and in other places, they have also their separate cemeteries. If this latter privilege has not as yet been granted to Protestant strangers sojourning in Spain, we have little doubt that it will soon be conceded; whenever, in fact, it will be demanded in a proper manner, by a sufficient number of Protestants to render a separate burial place an object of importance or necessity. The only complaint which the very few non-Catholics passing through, or residing for a time in Spain, can now make on this subject is, that in case of death they are not buried in ground expressly set apart and blessed for Catholic interment, or with the solemnities which usually accompany the Catholic funeral; — privileges which they would scarcely covet, even in this free country. Those who make so much noise about Spanish intolerance in the matter of Protestant funerals, wholly lose sight of, or purposely conceal the fact, that in Protestant England — where there are a thousand resident Catholic *citizens* for every Protestant *stranger* in Spain — Catholics are not allowed to be buried, with any pomp or ceremonial, in the public cemeteries; though these are, in many instances, old Catholic burial grounds, wrested by violence from their original Catholic purpose by the English Protestant government! The Catholics of England have thus much more reason to complain on this subject, than have the very few Protestants who may happen to be for a time in Spain.

Let us now take a rapid glance at the Protestant nations of Europe. In all of them, without an exception known to us, there is an established

Hosted by Google

religion, with a union of Church and State. In the freest amongst them all — England — Catholics are barely tolerated; they are continually loaded with obloquy and abuse, and are frequently made the victims of petty legal enactments. Witness the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill; the late savage outbreak of indignation at the re-establishment of the Catholic hierarchy; the bitter prosecution of Dr. Newman; and the monster grievance of all — the bloated church establishment — fattened on the sweat and blood of the crushed and down-trodden masses of the people. Protestant Holland recently persecuted her Catholic subjects to such an extent, as to drive them into a rebellion, the result of which was the independence of Catholic Belgium. Protestant Prussia lately imprisoned the venerable Archbishop of Cologne, to compel him to sacrifice his conscientious convictions; and Protestant Baden is now actively engaged in a similar disgraceful persecution of the venerable Archbishop Vicari, of Freyburg, and of his clergy, for the same unhallowed motive. But the Archbishop of Freyburg is destined to triumph over the intolerant Protestant government of the Grand Duke, as he of Cologne triumphed over the persecuting Prussian monarch.[1] In Protestant Sweden, he who dares become a Catholic is banished the country, and his property is confiscated to the state; and we believe a similar law exists in Protestant Denmark. In Sweden, but a few years ago, the distinguished painter Nilsen suffered the full penalty of this iniquitous law; and more recently still several ladies, distinguished for their piety, have had the same severe sentence passed on them. Heartless must be the persecutor, who does not spare even the weakness of woman! Finally, every one knows how fiercely the Swiss Protestants raged against the Catholics, when the latter were overpowered by superior numbers in the late civil war, brought about itself by the most reckless Protestant intolerance; how the holy Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva was banished from his country; how the Jesuits were expelled, and the poor defenseless nuns were driven from their convents; how church property was confiscated, including even that of the benevolent monks of Mount St. Bernard, who had saved so many valuable Protestant lives amidst the snows of the Alps; and how an iron yoke was there placed on the necks of the down-trodden Catholic minority.

If there be a Protestant country in the world, which has not even recently persecuted Catholics, we have not yet learned its name; and it ill becomes our opponents to charge *all* the persecution on the Catholic

1 What aggravates the hardship of the persecution in regard to both these distinguished Catholic prelates, is the circumstance, that both were octogenarians of irreproachable character, whose age and virtues should have protected them from such outrages.

Hosted by Google

Church. A persistence in preferring such an accusation, against all evidence, reminds us of the fable concerning the wolf and the lamb. It was the lamb who always muddled the stream! No one can contravene these facts; and if they be unpleasant, we have at least the consolation to think that we had no agency in making them *facts;* and that we allege them at present only in self-vindication.

Even in our own country, though it boasts so loudly of its freedom, how often have Catholics been made the victims of religious intolerance! Every one knows the fierce spirit which is now invoked against them; every one remembers the smouldering ruins of the Ursuline Convent on Mount Benedict, and those of the Philadelphia Churches burned by a savage mob; and all are acquainted with those more recent outrages against our religious liberties to which we have already alluded. We may add, that in some of our hospitals, alms-houses, and other public institutions, supported by the money of all, Catholics are often denied the services of their clergymen and the consolations of religion, even at their dying hour![1]

On the contrary, have Catholics ever persecuted, or have they ever shown even the slightest disposition to persecute, their dissenting brethren in this country? If they have, we desire to know when and where they made the attempt. One thing is certain, — and no one can deny it, or rob them of this glory: — they were the first who reared on this broad continent, in their own noble colony of Maryland, the glorious banner of civil and religious liberty. All must award them this praise; which they deserve the more, because, at that very time, the Puritans of New England, and the Episcopalians of Virginia were busily engaged in persecuting their brother Protestants for conscience sake;[2] and the former were moreover enacting proscriptive blue laws, and hanging witches![3]

II. Come we now to the other charge against Catholics; —that they cannot, consistently with their principles, be good citizens of a republican government. Catholics cannot consistently be republicans! And pray, who originated all the free principles which lie at the basis of our own noble constitution? Who gave us trial by jury, *habeas corpus*, stationary courts, and the principle,— for which we fought and conquered in our revolutionary struggle against Protestant England,— that taxes are not to be levied without the free consent of those who pay them? Are we

1 Cases of this petty persecution have occurred in Cincinnati, and in other places, particularly in the Eastern and Northern States.

2 See Bancroft's History — Maryland.

3 For full details on this subject, read the Essays on Our Colonial Blue Laws, P. 353, seqq.

Hosted by Google

indebted to Protestantism for even ONE of these cardinal elements of free government? No; not for one. They all date back to the good old Catholic times, in the middle ages — some three hundred years before the dawn of the reformation! Our Catholic forefathers gave them all to us; not one of them do we owe to Protestants.

Again, we are indebted to Catholics for all the republics which ever existed in Christian times, down to the year 1776; for those of Switzerland, Venice, Genoa, Andorra, San Marino, and a host of minor free commonwealths, which sprang up in the "dark" ages. Some of these republics lingered until a comparatively recent date; some still exist, proud monuments and unanswerable evidences of Catholic devotion to freedom. These facts no one can deny; they stand out too boldly on the historic record. They are acknowledged by Protestants, no less than by Catholics. We subjoin the testimony of an able writer in the New York Tribune, believed to be Bayard Taylor, who is connected with the management of that journal. This distinguished traveler — a staunch Protestant — appeals to history, and speaks from personal observation. He writes:

"Truth compels us to add that the oldest republic now existing is that of San Marino, not only Catholic but wholly surrounded by the especial dominion of the Popes, who might have crushed it like an egg-shell at any time these last thousand years — but they didn't. The only republic we ever traveled in besides our own is Switzerland, half of its cantons or states entirely Catholic, yet never that we have heard of unfaithful to the cause of freedom. They were nearly all Roman Catholics, from the southern cantons of Switzerland, whom Austria so ruthlessly expelled from Lombardy after the suppression of the last revolt in Milan, accounting them natural born republicans and revolutionists; and we suppose Austria is not a Know-Nothing on this point. We never heard the Catholics of Hungary accused of backwardness in the late glorious struggle of their country for freedom, though its leaders were Protestants, fighting against a leading Catholic power avowedly in favor of religious as well as civil liberty. And chivalric, unhappy Poland, almost wholly Catholic, has made as gallant struggles for freedom as any other nation, while of the three despotisms that crushed her but one was Catholic. But enough. We do not hope to stop the crusade of intolerance and violence now setting against the Catholics, calling for their disfranchisement, and threatening their temporary exclusion from all public trusts. Epidemics of this sort must have their course; and this one has some truth and a large amount of honest bigotry on which to base its operations. Quite a number, whose religion never till now did them much good or harm, will ride into office on the back of their resonant Protestantism, and that will be the end of the matter."

The reformation dawned on the world in the year 1517. What did it do for the cause of human freedom from that date, down to 1776 — when our own republic arose? Did it strike one blow for liberty during these

Hosted by Google

two centuries and a half? Did it originate one republican principle, or found one solitary republic? Not one. In Germany, where it had full sway, it ruthlessly trampled in the dust all the noble franchises of the Catholic middle ages; it established political despotism everywhere; it united church and state; in a word it brought about that very state of things which continues to exist, with but slight amelioration, even down to the present day. In England, it did the same; it broke down the bulwarks of the British constitution, derived from the Catholic Magna Charta; it set at naught popular rights, and gave to the king or queen unlimited power in church and state; and it required a bloody struggle and a revolution, one hundred and fifty years afterwards, to restore to something of their former integrity the old chartered rights of the British people.[1]

Thus Protestantism has boasted much, but it has really done little for the cause of human freedom. But are we not at least indebted to it for our own revolution, and for the liberties which it has secured for us? We cheerfully award to our Protestant fellow-citizens the praise, which is so justly due them, for *their* share in the glorious struggle; but they should also, in common justice, allow to Catholics the credit of having zealously co-operated with them, to the full extent of their means, in bringing about a result so glorious and so beneficial. He who was the most wealthy among the signers of our Declaration of Independence, and who consequently periled most in putting his name to that instrument, was the Catholic CHARLES CARROLL, of CARROLTON; whom Providence permitted to survive all his fellow-patriots, as if to rebuke the fierce and anti-republican spirit of intolerance, which was so soon to be evoked from the abyss against his brethren in religion. Catholic soldiers fought side by side with their Protestant brethren in the patriotic struggle; and when our energies were exhausted, and the stoutest hearts entertained the most gloomy forebodings as to the final issue, Catholic France stepped gallantly forth to the rescue of our infant freedom, almost crushed by an overwhelming English *Protestant* tyranny![2] Many of our most sagacious statesmen have believed, that, but for this timely aid, our Declaration of Independence could scarcely have been made good.

Our enemies point, with an air of triumph, to the principles of Washington. We cheerfully accept the appeal. After the struggle was over, and Washington was unanimously elected first President of the

1 For more on this subject, see the Essay on the Influence of Catholicity on Civil Liberty; Page 131, seqq.

2 Catholic Spain also subsequently lent us her aid against England

Hosted by Google

new republic, he received a congratulatory address from the Catholics of the country, in which the following passage is found:

"This prospect of national prosperity is peculiarly pleasing to us on another account, because whilst our country preserves her freedom and independence, we shall have a well founded title to claim from her justice equal rights of citizenship, as the price of our blood spilt under your eyes, and of our common exertions for her defense under your auspicious conduct; rights rendered more dear to us by the rememberance of former hardships."[1]

To this portion of the Address, the father of his country replied as follows:

"As mankind become more liberal, they will be more apt to allow, that all those who conduct themselves as worthy members of the community are equally entitled to the protection of civil government. I hope ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality. And I presume that your fellow-citizens will not forget *the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their revolution, and the establishment of their government; or, the important assistance they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed.*"[2]

We ask no more than that to which Washington believed us justly entitled, — a fair share in the civil and religious liberties which our fathers aided to secure equally to all American citizens. We ask for no exclusive privilege whatsoever; we claim only our clear and undoubted rights, in common with our fellow-citizens.

But are not Catholics the subjects of a foreign prince, the Pope? This slander — like almost everything else said against us — has been refuted so many thousand times already, that we are almost afraid to tire the patience, or insult the understanding of our readers by answering it again. No man of common intelligence or information need be told, at this late day, that the obedience we owe to the Pope is confined entirely to religion and to spiritual things; and that he neither claims, nor we allow, any jurisdiction over us in temporal matters affecting our civil allegiance. This question has been so long settled throughout the civilized world, that its revival at present appears to be wholly useless, if not utterly absurd.[3] When it was a question, more than sixty years ago, of removing some of the cruel penal laws under which the Catholics of

1 The Address was signed by Bishop Carroll of Baltimore, on the part of the Catholic clergy, and by Charles Carroll of Carrollton, Daniel Carroll, Thomas Fitzimmons, and Dominic Lynch, on the part of the Catholic laity. See Biographical Sketch of the Most Rev. John Carroll, by John Carroll Brent; p 146, 147.

2 Spark's Life and Writings of Washington, vol. xii.

3 As early as the beginning of the seventeenth century, St. Francis de Sales deprecated the discussion of this question on many accounts, and among other reasons, because he considered it "*useless*, since the Pope, in fact, at that day asked nothing of kings and princes in this respect — *Inutile*, parceque le Pape, par le fait, ne demande rien aujourd'hui aux rois et aux princes pour ce regard." Letter to a Lady. Vie du Saint, par le Curé de St. Sulpice,— in 2 volumes. Vol. ii, p. 106: Paris 1854.

Hosted by Google

England had been so long suffering, this very question in regard to the nature and extent of papal jurisdiction was discussed; and it was then settled to the entire satisfaction of Mr. Pitt and of the whole British parliament, which accordingly passed the Catholic Relief Bill.[1] The oath of allegiance freely taken by Catholic bishops, and members of parliament, and officers of the government in Great Britain and Ireland, with the sanction of the Popes themselves, expressly disclaims belief in any civil power or jurisdiction over British subjects, as inherent in the sovereign Pontiffs.

To prevent all possibility of misunderstanding on this subject, and to remove every pretext for calumny, the Popes authorized a change in the oath taken by a Bishop at his consecration, striking out all obscure clauses of feudal origin, and retaining those only which promised obedience in spirituals. What more than this could be asked by any reasonable man, for the final settlement of the question? The Catholic bishops of the United States, with the express sanction of Rome, take the oath, as thus modified; and they have more than once officially declared, both individually and in their collective capacity, their solemn belief that the Roman Pontiff has none but spiritual power and jurisdiction, outside of his own immediate states. The first Catholic bishop of the country — the venerable Carroll, of Baltimore,[2]— wrote as follows on this subject, in a Pastoral Letter issued February 22, 1797:[3]

"There would indeed be a foundation for the reproach intended by the words *foreign jurisdiction*, if we acknowledged in the successor of St. Peter any power or prerogative, which clashed in the least degree with the duty we owe to our country or its laws. To our country we owe allegiance and the tender of our best services and property, when they are necessary for its defense; to the Vicar of Christ we owe obedience in things *purely spiritual*. Happily, there is no competition in their respective claims on us, nor any difficulty in rendering to both the submission which they have a right to claim. Our country commands,

1 Mr. Pitt made inquiries on this subject at the Catholic universities of the Sorbonne, Louvain, Douay, Alcala, and Salamanca. Their answers were all distinct and unanimous, as follows:

I. That the Pope or cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, has not, nor have, any civil authority power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatsoever, within the realm of England.

II. That the Pope, or cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, cannot absolve or dispense with his Majesty's subjects from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever.

III That there is no principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions, in any transactions, either of a public or a private nature.

See the documents at greater length, in Butler's Book of the Church, Appendix I, p. 287-8.

2 It may not be generally known, that Dr Franklin, when minister to France, had several conferences with the Nuncio of the Pope on the subject of having a Catholic bishop appointed for America; that he approved of the plan, in order that American Catholics might not be dependent on an English bishop; and that he recommended for the post Dr. Carroll, his friend and companion in the mission to Canada.

3 Biographical Sketch, &c., *sup. cit.* P. 137-8.

Hosted by Google

and enforces by outward coercion, the services which tend to the preservation and defense of that personal security, and of that property, for the sake of which political societies were formed, and men agreed to live under the protection of, and in obedience to civil government. The Vicar of Christ, as visible head of His Church, watches over the integrity and soundness of doctrine, and makes use of means and weapons that act only on the souls of men, to enforce the duties of religion, the purity of worship, and ecclesiastical discipline."

Our bishops, assembled in solemn council at Baltimore, have often publicly proclaimed principles identical with those just announced, as emanating from the venerable founder of our hierarchy. We can make room for but two extracts, the first of which is taken from a Pastoral Letter issued by them in the sixth provincial council of Baltimore, held in May, 1846; from which it will be seen that our bishops, in their collective and official capacity, are very plain and explicit in their declarations on this very point:

"The paternal authority of the chief Bishop is constantly misrepresented and assailed by the adversaries of our holy religion, especially in this country, and is viewed with suspicion even by some who acknowledge its powerful influence in preserving faith and unity. It is unnecessary for us to tell you, brethren, that the kingdom of Christ, of which the Bishop of Rome, as successor of Peter, has received the keys, is not of this world; and that the obedience due to the Vicar of the Saviour is in no way inconsistent with your civil allegiance, your social duties as citizens, or your rights as men. We can confidently appeal to the whole tenor of our instructions, not only in our public addresses, but in our most confidential communications, and you can bear witness that we have always taught you to render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, to God the things which are God's. Be not, then, heedful of the misrepresentations of foolish men, who, unable to combat the evidences of our faith, seek to excite unjust prejudice against that authority which has always proved its firmest support. Continue to practise justice and charity towards all your fellow-citizens — respect the magistrates — observe the laws — shun tumult and disorder, as free, and not as having liberty as a cloak for malice, but as the servants of God. You, brethren, have been called unto liberty: only make not liberty an occasion to the flesh, but by charity of the spirit, serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Thus you will put to shame the calumniators of our holy faith, and vindicate it more effectually, than by any abstract profession or disclaimer."

But there is another declaration, made by the bishops who composed the fifth council of Baltimore, held in May, 1843, which has even more weight in settling this question; because it occurs in an official Letter addressed to the Pope by the assembled American prelates. The Pontiff, far from being offended at so explicit a disavowal by the American bishops of all papal authority and jurisdiction in merely civil matters, says in his official answer: "Your letter was most pleasing to us;"[1] and he praises the zeal of our prelates. Here is the extract

1 Gratissimæ Nobis fuere Vestrae Literae.

Hosted by Google

alluded to ;— the bishops are speaking of the efforts made by our enemies to put down the Church in this country :

"They spread doubtful rumors against us among the people ; with untiring efforts, they circulate among the ignorant and uninformed books, which calumniate our most holy religion ; they leave no means untried to infect with their errors their Catholic servants ; and . . . although our forefathers poured out their blood like water for the defense of our liberties against a *Protestant* oppressor, they yet seek to render us, their fellow citizens, suspected by, and odious to the government, *by falsely asserting that we are reduced to servitude under the civil and political jurisdiction of a foreign prince, namely of the Roman Pontiff, and that we are therefore unfaithful to the republic !*" [1]

But did not the Popes formerly claim the right of deposing princes, and of absolving their subjects from the oath of allegiance ? They certainly did ; and so did we claim the same right, when we deposed George III., and declared ourselves "absolved" from our oath of allegiance to him : and as our claim was assuredly nothing against liberty, but all for liberty, so was also that of the Popes. In every instance of its exercise, known to us, the Popes struck a blow at tyranny, and one, at the same time, for the security and liberty of an oppressed people. Instead of blaming, we should rather applaud them, for thus keeping alive, amidst political darkness and confusion, that spark of popular liberty, which was destined, a little later, to illumine the political horizon of Europe. That the friends of European monarchs should object to this papal claim, we can readily understand, because its exercise was necessarily directed against their tyranny ; but we cannot so easily explain the opposition to it manifested by our modern advocates of free principles. Yet the monarchists of Europe, along with Mr. Pitt, have long since been fully satisfied on this point ; whereas our shrewder republicans have just begun to open their eyes to the awful danger to our freedom growing out of a claim, no longer advanced even by the Popes themselves !

Having in the following pages devoted a special Essay to the examination of the historical facts connected with the first exercise of the deposing power by a Roman Pontiff, we must refer our readers to it for full details on the subject.[2] Suffice it to say here, that the circumstances under which this extraordinary power was first claimed having long since ceased, the

1 "Dubias contra nos in vulgus voces spargunt, libros qui calumniantur sanctissimam nostram religionem omni nisu apud rudes ignarosque divulgant ; servos suos Catholicos hæresum suarum veneno ut inficiant nihil intactum relinquunt ; patremque suum qui ab initio mendax fuit imitantes, nos Catholicos concives suos, quamvis patres nostri sanguinem suum tanquam aquam profuderint pro vindicatione libertatis contra oppressorem acatholicum, gubernio suspectos obnoxiosque reddere utpote, ut falso asserunt, sub alieni principis, Pontificis sc. Romani ditione politica et civili in servitutem redactos, ideoque reipublicæ infidos." Conciliia Baltimor., p. 223

2 See Article VIII, Gregory VII. and his Age—the Deposing Power, P. 152 seqq.

Hosted by Google

Popes have, for nearly three centuries, virtually abandoned the claim, by making no attempt at its exercise.

With a view to show that the influence of the Catholic Church tends to debase its members, our adversaries direct attention to the material condition of those countries which have continued faithful to the ancient religion, and upon which the light of the reformation has never dawned. These, they say, are very far inferior to the neighboring Protestant communities in thrift, in literature, in morals, in liberty, and especially in material and social improvement; and this inferiority they trace to the difference of religious influence. We answer, by denying both the fact as stated, and the inference thence drawn. Abundant evidence can be alleged to show, that, if in some respects Protestant are superior to Catholic nations, in others the latter far surpass the former; and that, in both cases, a difference of religious principles has much less to do with the matter than is commonly believed by those opposed to Catholicity. As, however, we devote six articles in the following collection to a somewhat detailed comparison of the two classes of countries in question, we will be excused from entering at present into the investigation; content with referring those who may be curious to examine the evidence, as furnished even by impartial Protestant writers, to those papers.[1]

To those, again, who are in the habit of pointing, with a sneer, to the comparatively degraded condition of Mexico and South America, as a natural consequence of the Catholic religion there professed, we would beg to observe, that the masses of the population in Spanish and Portuguese America are either of pure Indian descent, or of mixed races; and that consequently, it is manifestly unreasonable to expect them to have attained to the same elevated social level as ourselves, who belong to the much boasted and loudly boasting Anglo-Saxon stock![2] As well might we expect to find our own high degree of civilization in the descendants of our North American Indians! There is this important difference between our policy and that of our Catholic neighbors, in regard to the treatment of the aboriginal inhabitants of this continent; that, whereas we have exterminated them or driven them out into the wilderness, they, on the contrary, have settled down in their midst, intermarried with them, taught them Christianity, and thus sought to raise them up in the social scale, even at the expense of lowering themselves. While they have met the aborigines half-way, and have been content to occupy with them

1 Entitled — Catholic and Protestant Countries — P. 454, seqq. In these articles our reasoning and illustrations are based chiefly on Protestant testimony.

2 Not unmixed, however; for we have a strong infusion of the Celtic blood.

Hosted by Google

a middle ground between a high and a low level of civilization, we, wrapped up in our inborn complacency, and vaunting our high social position as the necessary result of our "Anglo-Saxon blood," have looked with contempt upon the poor savages whom our fathers found in the country, — much as the proud Pharisee looked down upon the poor publican, — have disdained all sympathy for, or alliance with them, and have caused them to melt away before our advancing and exclusive civilization, as the snow melts away before the solar rays! The comparison between us and our Catholic neighbors may excite our complacency, and flatter our pride; it says but little for our humanity, and less still for our religious zeal or Christian charity. Our Protestant fellow citizens would do well never to vaunt their superiority over their Mexican and South American brethren![1] American Catholics, on the contrary, have reason to be proud of the Catholic colonists who explored and peopled our continent.[2]

To awaken suspicion against the Catholic priesthood, the public prints have long been circulating among the people the extraordinary assertion, that Lafayette warned American patriots against priestly influence, in the following language: "If ever the liberty of the United States is destroyed, it will be by Romish priests." The fact of such a declaration coming from one who was a Catholic himself, if he was anything, bears the stamp of very great intrinsic improbability, to say the least, on its face; yet it passed current for truth, and was, we think, generally believed by the masses, who are prepared to devour any absurdity, provided it militate against Catholics. Now, what will the impartial public think, should it be ascertained, that this charge, like most others which have been lately circulated in this country to our disadvantage, is not only utterly groundless, but is directly the reverse of truth? That such is the case clearly appears from the fact, that about the time when Lafayette is reported to have used the expression, he said what is, in its import, precisely the contrary, in a speech made by him in the French Chambers on the 9th of April, 1832.[3] The subject in debate was the expulsion from France of certain foreign refugees, including some Irish monks who were sojourning with the French Trappists at the famous Monastery of Melleray. The French patriot, true to his principles in favor of civil and religious liberty, earnestly opposed the bill, and in the course of his remarks employed the following strong language:

1 We treat this subject in full in our review of Webster's Bunker Hill Speech; p. 333, seqq.

2 For more on the subject, see the two papers reviewing Prescott's Conquest of Mexico, p. 350, seqq., and the three articles on Early Catholic Missions in the North-West, p. 298, seqq.

3 Found in the "Memoires, Correspondence," &c., of Lafayette, published by his favorite son George Washington Lafayette, in six vols. 8vo.

Hosted by Google

"I know well that in the Report they have spoken of the expulsion of some Englishmen who had entered among the Trappists at Melleray, as a measure of good and wise administration. Such measures, gentlemen, are not among those which will merit my eulogy. Mistake not rigor for strength, nor despotism for power; then you will not have need of all these precautions, and the Trappists of Melleray will not be more dangerous for you, THAN ARE THE JESUITS OF GEORGETOWN TO THE UNITED STATES."

If the Jesuits of Georgetown — their head-quarters in this country — were not by him deemed dangerous to the United States, a fortiori, according to the view of Protestants, the other Catholic Clergy could not be so considered either by them, or by Lafayette. We will treat of this more fully hereafter.[1]

But we are further told, that Catholics in this country stand aloof from their Protestant fellow-citizens, and form a virtually separate society, having neither feelings nor interests in common with others; and that they cast their vote in a body for a particular political party. Let us briefly examine these heads of accusation.

1. If the charge of our forming a separate community, with separate feelings and interests, refer to our religious organization and principles, we must plead guilty; it is surely not our fault, but our privilege, to differ on religious matters with such of our fellow-citizens as belong either to no religious communion whatever, or are members of the various conflicting sects which exist among us. We cheerfully allow to them the right of thinking and acting for themselves in matters of religion without molestation, and they should surely grant us the same freedom:—Hanc veniam petimus, damusque vicissim. This privilege should be the more cheerfully accorded to us, as we propose no innovation, but merely claim the right of walking, as our forefathers, as well as the ancestors of our accusers themselves walked, and went to heaven, for fifteen hundred years, before the world was blessed or cursed with this Babel-like confusion of tongues in the matter of religion.

If the accusation be meant to imply, that we are a separate *civil* community, and that, as citizens, we have feelings and interests different from those of others, we repel the charge as an injurious slander. Catholics cordially participate in all our civic anniversary festivals; they pray in their churches for all their fellow citizens, and for the permanent prosperity of this free government;[2] they nobly fight the battles of the country, and they are as willing to shed their blood in its defense or for its honor, as any of their brethren. In a word, they yield to none in patriotism and valor. About one-half of our regular army — if not even a larger

1 See Article entitled, Lafayette and Professor Morse, p. 635, seqq.

2 The beautiful prayer, for the "Ruling Powers," composed by Archbishop Carroll, is frequently read in our churches.

Hosted by Google

proportion — is composed of Roman Catholic soldiers; a large number of the sailors and marines, attached to our young but vigorous navy, are also Catholics; and our chief officers in both arms of the service have often praised their fidelity to our flag, and their unfaltering courage in the hour of danger. In every battle-field of our country, — in the two wars against *Protestant* England, as well as in the late war against *Catholic* Mexico, — Catholics have freely bled, by the side of their Protestant fellow citizens, for the honor and triumph of our country.

After the death of General Washington, bishop Carroll pronounced a splendid eulogy on his character, in the cathedral of Baltimore;[1] and after the battle of New Orleans, General Jackson was received in triumph in the Catholic cathedral, the laurel garland of victory, woven by Catholic hands, was placed on his brow by a Catholic priest; and the noble hero might be seen weeping with joyful emotion, as he listened and responded to the eloquent and patriotic address delivered on the occasion by the Rev. M. Dubourg. In a beautiful address delivered in Washington by Mr. Livingston, on the anniversary of the battle of New Orleans, the distinguished orator feelingly alluded to the pavement of the church being worn by the holy knees of the Ursuline nuns, praying fervently that victory might perch on the American banner, and drawing from the feast of the day — that of St. Victoria — an omen of success! We repeat it, the charge, understood in this sense, is a base calumny.

2. But we are not friendly to the common schools. Our answer is at hand. Let the Protestant majority, in this free country, make those schools such as not to wound the religious feelings, nor endanger the religious faith of our children, and then may they, with some show of reason, taunt us with not cheerfully uniting in patronizing them. Let them remove from them all sectarian books, all sectarian influences, all teachers who abuse their position for purposes of proselytism; let them not force upon our children the reading of a version of the Bible, which, in common with four-fifths of Christendom, we consider neither a genuine nor a complete rendering of the divine word:[2] — and then they will make it not only our interest, but our pleasure to unite with them in supporting the common schools. It will be our interest; for, in common with our fellow citizens, we pay our taxes for the erection and maintenance of

1 This solid and noble oration is published in full in the "Biographical Sketch of Archbishop Carroll," above quoted, 158, seqq. The panegyric, by one who knew so well the Father of his country, produced a profound sensation at the time it was delivered.

2 And with which a large and influential portion of the Protestant community in this country is so far dissatisfied, as to have taken steps already for issuing a new and different version, more conformable to their own views.

Hosted by Google

those schools; and if we do not patronize them, we have to incur the enormous additional expense of erecting separate schools for our own children, and are thus double-taxed for educational purposes. The motive which would prompt us to make so great a sacrifice must be indeed a very strong one; and it is really we who have the best right to complain, not the Protestant majority which enforces such a hardship upon us. If we could conscientiously do it, we have every possible motive to patronize the common schools; but we hold that is is better far to suffer every earthly loss, than to jeopardize our faith, or that of our children. Life is short, eternity never ending; and "what doth it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"[1]

In countries much less free than ours, the common school system is so organized, that Catholics and Protestants have separate schools. Austria, with all her alleged tyranny, and with her triumphant Catholic majority of population, freely grants separate schools, supported out of the common fund, to the Protestant minority.[2] England, with all her hereditary hatred of Catholicity, permits the Catholics to have their own separate schools; and this is not found to conflict in practice with her common school system. Lower Canada, with its immense Catholic majority, freely concedes the privilege of separate schools to the small Protestant minority; and every one who reads the public prints must be familiar with the controversy, which is now carried on in Canada, and even in the Canadian parliament, on the subject of having this same equitable provision extended, in all its privileges, to the Catholic minority of Upper Canada. Strange, that Catholics, when in power, should be so liberal in granting a privilege, which a Protestant majority is so slow to concede![3]

Why should the freest country on the face of the earth form an exception, and be in fact the most exacting and tyrannical of all, in this matter of education? Can it be, that the immense Protestant majority in this country is apprehensive of the influence, which, in the case of this equitable provision being adopted, would be exercised by the small Catholic minority? Or are they afraid of entering the lists of free competition with their Catholic fellow-citizens? While all other pursuits are left open to honest emulation, and the rivalry does good to all, why should education alone be trammeled, by being made a state monopoly?

1 St. Matthew xvi.

2 See Article II. on Catholic and Protestant Countries, for the *Protestant* authority sustaining this assertion. Infra. P. 485, seqq. We believe that this is also, at least substantially, the case in Catholic Bavaria, as well as in Catholic France and Belgium; at any rate we hear of no complaints made by Protestants on the subject, in regard to these or other Catholic countries, where Protestants exist as a resident body. See also a special paper on Common Schools; infra, P. 652, et seqq.

3 See late Canadian papers, *passim*.

Hosted by Google

We are persuaded, that the provision for separate schools would greatly promote the permanency and prosperity of the common school system itself. It would destroy an odious restriction on parental rights, it would awaken a new energy in the cause of education, it would open new fields for generous rivalry; and, above all, it would render education much cheaper, and thereby lighten that heavy burden of taxation which is now weighing us down. It is a generally conceded fact, that Catholics can educate more cheaply than Protestants; and this may be one reason why the latter are not willing to hazard a free competition with the former. Grant separate schools, and our word for it, you will not have to pay much more than half the taxes you have been in the habit of disbursing for educational purposes. While we cheerfully submit to be guided by the principle of taxing the rich in order to educate the poor, — since under our present circumstances, it seems to be the only practicable means for effecting an object so desirable, — we naturally object, in common with all impartial and sensible men, to any excessive or unnecessary taxation.[1]

In Catholic times, no taxation whatever was necessary for educational purposes, especially for the education of the poor. Under the influence of Catholic charity and zeal for education, colleges and schools sprang up spontaneously in every part of Europe. These schools were FREE, in every sense of the word; no one was taxed to erect them, no one had to pay for entering them.[2] The first college, the first schools, and the first hospital, ever established on the North American continent, were erected by Catholics.[3] In all countries and in all ages, Catholics, and particularly the Catholic clergy, have been foremost in advancing the cause of popular education.[4]

It would be a subject of very useful inquiry, whether our common school system, as at present managed, be really conducive to a high tone of refinement, and to the development of sound morals, in the youth educated under its auspices. It is a Christian principle, of pretty general acceptance, that human nature is corrupt and more prone to evil than to good; and that consequently the religion of Christ is indispensably necessary for healing its evil tendency and causing it to walk in the path of virtue. The theory, which makes morality practicable, or even

1 It is generally known, that what is undertaken and executed by the state usually costs much more money than what is done by individuals; and the same may be said of works carried on by corporations.

2 See, for details, the Article on Schools and Universities in the "Dark" Ages, P. 113, seqq.

3 See the Articles on Catholic Missions in the North West; First Paper, P. 298, seqq. Also the papers on the Conquest of Mexico: sup. cit.

4 See the Article — Literature and the Catholic Clergy, P. 96. Read also the Lecture on Literature and the Arts in the Middle Ages; P. 77, seqq.

Hosted by Google

possible, without religion, is evidently more Pagan than Christian. If this be so, how can the children educated in our common schools be properly trained to sound morality, without a course of religious instruction, which the system excludes? To say, that sufficient religious knowledge for the purpose may be imparted, without what is called *Sectarian* teaching, seems to us wholly preposterous. To be adequate, the religious instruction should be detailed and practical, not general, vague, and theoretical; but the latter only can be compatible with our present school system, while the former could scarcely be carried out without trenching on forbidden ground. But let us look at the practical influence of the system, as exhibited in the general moral conduct of the youth educated in our common schools. Do these, in general, show, by their moral deportment, that they have been properly trained? Have they been taught politeness, respect for age, obedience to parents, morality in thought, word, and deed? We fear not. Our youth are growing more and more licentious and demoralized, with each succeeding generation; our boys particularly become men before they are half grown; they have learned all else better, than the art of governing their passions. The late fearful increase of crime, especially in our cities and towns, is a sad proof of this increasing demoralization. To what an abyss of vice are we hastening! There must be something sadly wrong somewhere.

3. But Catholics, especially those of foreign birth, vote together, and vote for a particular political party: the liberties of our country are therefore endangered from this constantly augmenting foreign influence. This charge is groundless, both in its facts and in its inferences. In the first place, our native born Catholics have been heretofore divided, almost equally, between the two leading political parties of the country; in the second place, though the large majority of the Catholics of foreign birth have been in the habit of voting with the democrats, yet they have been far from unanimous on the subject; in the third place, the number of Catholics in this country is now, and is likely to continue to be, much too insignificant to rule the country in one way or another, either for good or for evil.

The following candid and sensible remarks from the Boston Post, a political print of some standing, contains so much sound reasoning on this subject, based upon facts tending to show the glaring absurdity of the charge that "foreigners are taking the country," that we will be pardoned for republishing them entire:

"It is said that we shall be overrun with foreigners; that they will rise upon native citizens and overpower them; that Catholicism will prevail

Hosted by Google

and deprive America of its liberties. These assertions have been reiterated so often that thousands really fear such results. Take the former apprehension, and let facts, so far as they bear on the question of physical force, say how groundless that fear is. In the first place, for the whole time we have been a nation, it is a fact that no such attempt has been made; and if it ever should be made, such is the admirable working of our institutions, that the rule of a mob is utterly out of the question. Permanent success, even where the foreign population outweighs the native population, is an impossibility; for the whole force of the country would at once be invoked to suppress such a rule. In the next place, consider the utter folly, want of foresight, and suicidal policy of such an attempt, if it should ever be made. Of our now thirty millions of population one million[1] only are from Ireland: of the thirty-eight thousand churches that the census of 1850 shows as being in the country, the Catholic are set down at one thousand two hundred and twenty-one; and of the eighty-seven millions of church property, the Catholics have nine millions. Now, cannot this immense preponderance of Protestantism and of Americanism take care of itself? Is it not perfectly preposterous to suppose for a moment that the Irish Catholics will ever attempt to 'rise,' as the phrase is, with such an enormous disparity against them? It is due, it is but bare justice, to our foreign population to say, that not only has there been no attempt at rising, but their conduct — save only in cases when heated by liquor or otherwise excited — has been almost invariably that of peaceable citizens, submissive to the laws. They have a right to have such a certificate, as to the past, to stand in their favor; and when we consider their position among us, we believe there is no more danger of their 'rising' than there is of the falling of the stars."

Much has been said and written of late years about the "foreign vote." Both parties, on the eve of elections, have been in the habit of courting "foreigners;" who have thus, against their own choice and will, been singled out from the rest of the community, and placed in a false and odious position, by political demagogues for their own vile purposes. That they have been thus severed from their fellow citizens, and insulted with the compliment of their influence as a separate body, has not been so much their fault, as it has been their misfortune. From the successful party they have generally received, — with a few honorable exceptions — little but coldness *after* the election; while from the party defeated, they have invariably received nothing but abuse and calumny. So they have been, without their own agency, placed between two fires, and have been caressed and outraged by turns. Any appeal made to them by politicians, in their character of religionists or foreigners, and not in that of American citizens, is manifestly an insult, whether so intended or not; and we trust that Catholics will always view such appeals in this light. Whenever it is question of state policy, they can have no interests different from those of their fellow citizens. The laws which will be good for the latter, will be good for them; at least they can live under any system of equal

1 The number is probably greater; but this does not affect the argument.

Hosted by Google

legislation which will suit the Protestant majority, with whom they cheerfully share all the burdens of the country.

The Catholic bishops and clergy of the country have discreetly stood aloof, and wisely abstained from exercising any influence in the exciting political contests which have successively arisen. We ourselves, though to the manor born, have never even voted on a political question; and we believe that most of our brother prelates and clergy have adopted the same prudent precaution; not surely through any want of interest in the country, but chiefly with a view to remove from the enemies of our Church the slightest pretext for slandering our religious character. The only influence, we have sought to bring to bear on the members of our communion, has been invariably in the interests of peace, of order, and of charity for all men, even for our most bitter enemies. Whenever we have had occasion to address our people on the eve of elections, we have counseled them to avoid all violence, to beware of being carried away by passion, to be temperate, to respect the feelings and principles of their opponents; and, in the exercise of their franchise as citizens, to vote conscientiously for the men and measures they might think most likely to advance the real and permanent interests of the republic. We defy any one to prove, that we have ever attempted to exercise any other influence than this. The contrary has been occasionally asserted by unprincipled demagogues, for political effect; but the accusation, like many others made in the heat of political contests, has in every instance turned out to be a grievous slander; which was scarcely believed at the time, even by those who were most busy in giving it circulation.

Never since the foundation of the republic has it been heard of, that the Catholic bishops or clergy have taken an active part in conducting the proceedings of political conventions, or in fomenting political excitement, in the name of the religion of peace and love. They are not, and never have been, either abolitionists or freesoilers, ultraists or politico-religious alarmists. Nor have they ever ventured, either collectively or individually, to address huge remonstrances to congress, threatening vengeance in the name of Almighty God, unless certain particular measures were passed or repealed! Never have they been heard brawling in the public streets and highways, haranguing in violent language the already excited populace, lashing their passions into fury, and openly exciting them to deeds of mob violence and bloodshed! Never have they been known to parade the Bible in noisy political processions, thus prostituting the holy book, which breathes naught but

Hosted by Google

peace and good will towards all men, to the vile purposes of political faction and sectarian strife! Ministers of other denominations have done, or countenanced all these things; and we cheerfully leave to them all the glory, whether religious or political, which they can possibly derive from such a line of conduct.[1]

Catholics of foreign birth are charged, in the same breath, with voting the democratic ticket, and with being the secret or open enemies of republican government! Is it then true, that a man cannot be a democrat, without being a traitor to his country? If so, then have the destinies of this great republic been ruled, with very slight intermission, for nearly thirty years by an organized band of traitors, consisting of the vast majority of our population! Catholics can well afford to be traitors in such goodly company. We are no politicians ourselves, and, so far as we have had any political leanings, they have heretofore been to the policy of the whigs; but, in common with every man of sound judgment and liberal mind, we reprobate the spirit, which would thus inconsistently and absurdly brand the advocates of different principles as enemies of the country and of all liberty. The genius of our noble constitution is in favor of allowing to every man the largest liberty of opinion in matters of state policy, without his thereby incurring the risk of having his motives questioned or his loyalty impeached. If any charge could be consistently made or sustained against this large portion of our Catholic population, it would be, on the contrary, that they have been generally in favor of too enlarged a liberty, to tally with the views of those who profess to belong to the conservative school; but to charge them with an intention to undermine our republic, is simply an absurdity, as glaring as it is malicious.

Those who are loudest in their denunciations of "foreigners" seem to forget what "foreigners" have done for the country. They have filled our army and navy; they have fought our battles; they have leveled our forests, peopled our vast unoccupied territory, and filled our cities with operatives and mechanics; they have dug our canals, built our turnpikes and railroads, and have thus promoted, more perhaps than any other class, the improvement of the country and the development of its vast resources; in a word, they have, in every way, largely contributed towards enhancing

1 It is also well known that, particularly during the late elections, Protestant ministers took an active part in the canvass. In several instances, they were even candidates for office, and in some cases elected. It is they, and not the Catholics, who have thus attempted to mingle religion with politics; and if ever there be brought about a union of Church and State in this republic, it will surely not be accomplished by Catholics, but by those precisely who are foremost in the crusade against them! Let the lovers of freedom look to it in time! The Protestant ministers may, in fact, be said to be at the head of the abolition party in the north.

Hosted by Google

the wealth and increasing the prosperity of the republic. Do they deserve nothing but bitter denunciation and unsparing invective for all these services? Are they to be branded as aliens and traitors, for having thus effectually labored to serve their adopted country?

But they are foreigners in feeling and in interest, and they still prefer their own nationality to ours. We answer first, that if this their alleged feeling be excessive, and if it tend to diminish their love for the country of their adoption, it is certainly in so far reprehensible; but where is the evidence that this is the case? Has their lingering love for the country of their birth, — with its glowing memories of early childhood and ripening manhood, of a mother's care and a sister's love, — interfered in aught with their new class of duties as American citizens? Has it prevented their sharing cheerfully in the burdens, in the labors, and in the perils of the country? We believe not. Instead of their being unconcerned and indifferent, their chief fault, in the eyes of their enemies, lies precisely in the opposite, — in their taking *too much* interest in the affairs of the republic. We answer, in the second place, that this natural feeling of love for the country of their birth, growing as it does out of that cherished and honorable sentiment which we denominate patriotism, will, in the very nature of things, gradually diminish under the influence of new associations, until it will finally be absorbed into the one homogeneous nationality; and thus the evil — if it be an evil — will remedy itself. The only thing which can possibly keep it alive for any considerable time, would be precisely the narrow and proscriptive policy, adopted in regard to citizens of foreign birth by the Know Nothings and their sympathizers. The endeavor to stifle this feeling by clamor and violence will but increase its intensity.

We answer thirdly, that the influence of Catholicity tends strongly to break down all barriers of separate nationalities, and to bring about a brotherhood of citizens, in which the love of our common country and of one another would absorb every sectional feeling. Catholicity is of no nation, of no language, of no people; she knows no geographical bounds; she breaks down all the walls of separation between race and race, and she looks alike upon every people, and tribe, and caste. Her views are as enlarged as the territory which she inhabits; and this is as wide as the world. Jew and gentile, Greek and barbarian; Irish, German, French, English, and American, are all alike to her. In this country, to which people of so many nations have flocked for shelter against the evils they endured at home, we have a striking illustration of this truly Catholic

Hosted by Google

spirit of the Church. Germans, Irish, French, Italians, Spaniards, Poles, Hungarians, Hollanders, Belgians, English, Scotch, and Welch; differing in language, in national customs, in prejudices, — in every thing human, — are here brought together in the same Church, professing the same faith, and worshiping like brothers at the same altars! The evident tendency of this principle is, to level all sectional feelings and local prejudices, by enlarging the views of mankind, and thus to bring about harmony in society, based upon mutual forbearance and charity. And in fact, so far as the influence of our Church could be brought to bear upon the anomalous condition of society in America, it has been exercised for securing the desirable result of causing all its heterogeneous elements to be merged in the one variegated, but homogeneous nationality. Protestantism isolates and divides; Catholicity brings together and unites. Such have been the results of the two systems in times past; such, from their very nature, must be their influence on society at all times and in all places.

The character of the foreign immigration into this country has been undergoing a considerable change within the last few years; the German element now strongly predominates over the Irish, and perhaps the Protestant and infidel, over the Catholic. The disastrous issue of the revolutionary movements which convulsed all Europe in 1848–9, has thrown upon our shores masses of foreign political refugees, most of whom are infidels in religion, and red republicans, or destructionists of all social order, in politics. The greatest, and, in fact, the only real danger to the permanency of our republican institutions, is to be apprehended from this fast increasing class of foreigners, composed in general, of men of desperate character and fortune, — of outlaws from society, with the brand of infidelity upon their brow. Against the anarchical principles advocated by these men the Catholic Church takes open ground; and she feels honored by their bitter hostility. It could not be otherwise. Her principles are eminently conservative in all questions of religion and of civil polity; theirs are radical and destructive in both. Theirs is the old war of Satan against Christ; of the sons of Belial against the keepers of the law; of false and anti-social against true and rational liberty — "the liberty of the glory of the children of God."

If the lately organized secret political association warred against the pernicious principles maintained by such foreigners as these, we would not only have no cause to complain, but we would rather applaud their patriotic efforts in the cause of true freedom, and bid them God speed. But what is our astonishment to find, that our boasted advocates of "American

Hosted by Google

principles," instead of opposing, secretly or openly sympathize with these sworn enemies of all religion and of all social order — of God and man; as well as with the reckless and blood-stained Irish Orangemen! Say what you will, their efforts are directed almost solely against the Catholic element in the foreign immigration, and chiefly against the Irish Catholics. Their professions are belied by their acts, all of which point to Catholicity, as the victim whose ruin is to be accomplished, at all hazards, in this *free* and *republican* country. What else is indicated by the bloody riots gotten up by hired street brawlers against the Irish Catholics; what else by the wrecking and burning of Catholic churches? If the true policy of the country demands a revision or repeal of the naturalization laws, then bring about this result by fair, consistent, and honorable means; set about it in an open and manly manner, as men, as Americans, as Christians, not as cowards fearing the light of day, and skulking beneath the cover of darkness. If a new policy in regard to foreign immigrants is to be adopted, or if even the alien and sedition laws are to be re-enacted, let the country know your purpose in time, that all the true lovers of freedom may be prepared for the issue.

But the Irish immigrants are vicious and immoral. That a portion of them have their faults, — grievous and glaring faults, — we do not deny; but all fair and impartial men will admit, that the charge made against them as a body is atrociously unjust. They have their faults, which are paraded and greatly exaggerated by the public press; but they have also their virtues, which are studiously kept out of view. They have their faults; but have not the corresponding classes in our own population their vices also, as great, as, if not greater than those of the class which is now singled out as the victims of a virtuous public indignation?[1] They have their vices, but these are often faults of the head more than of the heart; of imprudence and thoughtlessness, more than of deliberate design and malice. If you look for the accomplished forger, the cold-blooded midnight assassin or murderer, the daring burglar, the man who goes always armed with the destructive bowie-knife or revolver, ready for any deed of blood, you will, in general, have to seek elsewhere than among the class of Irish immigrants, whom you so fiercely denounce.

The Irishman's vices are generally the result of intemperance, or of the sudden heat of passion, sometimes aroused by outrages upon his

1 Besides, is no allowance to be made for them, in consequence of that grinding oppression with which Protestant England has crushed them for centuries? We doubt much whether any other people would have stood up so well under a tyranny so dreadful and so long continued. See the Article — Ireland and the Irish, p. 506 — sup. cit.

Hosted by Google

country or religion; he is easily misled by evil associates, but his heart is generally in the right place. You can accomplish everything with him by mildness and persuasion; you can do nothing by overbearing harshness and reckless insult. The Irishman has no concealment in his character; what he is, he is openly and before the whole world; and this circumstance, together with the deadly hatred which has been lately awakened against his countrymen in this land of boasted freedom, may aid us in accounting for the singular fact, that so many Irish are arrested for real or alleged crimes, whereas so many of our natives, equally or more guilty, are permitted to go free! A riot occurs in one of our cities; the Irish get the worst of it; they are overpowered by superior numbers, are beaten and murdered; and in the end it turns out, that all those arrested are from the injured and outraged party themselves! The really guilty go free, the comparatively innocent are punished by the arm of the law.

Those among them who fall into crime have been already, in most instances, estranged from their Church by the influence of dangerous associations, often with the depraved portion of our own native population. They go not to the Church; they hear or heed not the voice of their pastors; they do not approach the sacraments; they are Catholics only in name, if even they retain the name. Whose fault is it, that they are thus estranged and corrupted? Not surely the fault of the Church, which seeks to reclaim and to save them. How can the pastors of the Church be held responsible for the misconduct of those who will not even hear their voice, or consent to be brought under the saving influence of the religion which they inculcate? Of all the charges which have been lately made against the Catholic Church, the most glaringly unjust is that, which ascribes the immorality of a certain class, amongst those who may still call themselves Catholics, to the disastrous influence which she exercises over their minds. These unfortunate men are thus seduced into habits of crime by evil influences acting entirely *outside* the Church, and then their crimes are laid at the door of the Church itself, which they have been induced practically to abandon! Was there ever iniquity greater than this?

The Church weeps, like a tender mother, over the sins of her children; she employs every kind and tender influence to win them back to virtue; she goes after them in their wanderings, as the Good Shepherd after the strayed sheep; she has no word of reproach or railing to frighten them farther away from the fold; with earnest and unfaltering love, she seeks

Hosted by Google

to reclaim them from their errors; no poverty, no misery however squalid or loathsome, no disease however infectious deters her from persuing her cherished work of mercy: and if she succeeds in her mission, her heart overflows with unspeakable joy and gladness, and she bears them back with maternal affection to her sanctuary, and lays them tenderly and joyously at the foot of her altars, as noble trophies of her labor of love. Her ministers labor day and night for the spiritual welfare of their people; they wear out their health, and grow prematurely old in assiduous toil among the poor and lowly; they often lay down their lives for their flocks. And if their zeal is not always crowned with success, if scandals still abound, in spite of their exertions to promote virtue, the unfortunate result is surely not owing to their fault, because clearly beyond their control.

The Church fails not at all times earnestly to inculcate on her children the duty of being good citizens of this republic, and of sincerely loving, and praying for *all* their fellow-citizens, even those who hate and revile them. She often addresses them in language similar to that, which was lately employed by one of our first prelates in age, learning, piety, and station,— Dr. Kenrick, the Archbishop of Baltimore, — the first episcopal see in the country. We cannot better conclude this Address than with an extract from his recent Pastoral Letter; and we are quite sure that every bishop, every priest, and every layman of our Church in this country will cheerfully subscribe to every sentiment and to every word therein contained:

"We take this occasion, brethren, to recommend to your most earnest prayers the peace, prosperity, and happiness of these United States, and of all our fellow-citizens. It is not our province, as pastors of the Church, to meddle with political interests: but it is our duty to exhort you to continue faithful to the constitution and government under which you have the happiness to live, obedient to the laws, respectful to all the civil authorities, and to prove yourselves by your conduct peaceful and orderly citizens. Be not concerned at the suspicions cast on your loyalty and patriotism, and the efforts made to proscribe you, and check the progress of our holy religion. 'Who is he that can hurt you, if you be zealous of good? But if, also, you suffer any thing for justice sake, blessed are ye. And be not afraid of their fear, and be not troubled. But sanctify the Lord Christ in your hearts.' Pursue, then, the peaceful path of industry, regardless of political partizanship; shun the use of intoxicating liquors; avoid secret societies; practise your religion; teach it to your children; take every opportunity to perform kind offices towards your fellow-citizens, whatever wrongs you may endure, and pray that God may lead all to the knowledge of the truth. This course of conduct is your best defense — your only security, whilst it will vindicate most effectually the honor of the Church. Keep far away from scenes of danger; from tumult and bloody strife. In the retirement of your chambers, and at the foot of the altar, pour out your hearts in prayer, that God may turn away

Hosted by Google

His anger and in the day of His just visitation may remember mercy. Implore Him to relieve our country from pestilence, which now strews the land with victims, from the disorders of the elements which spread terror and destruction,— but, above all, from the maddening influence of the demon of civil discord. Ask Him to continue and perpetuate those free institutions, which have hitherto united in social brotherhood and concord the millions of men of various nations and creeds, that, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, bask in the sunshine of liberty. Pray that to all may be imparted the still greater blessings of faith and love, that we may with one heart and mouth glorify God and fulfill his law, in order to our salvation."

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google

PART I.

HISTORICAL.

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google

Reviews, Essays, and Lectures.

PART I.—HISTORICAL.

I. CHURCH HISTORY.*

ARTICLE I.—THE EARLY AGES.

Palma and Palmer as historians — Rome and Oxford — Gratuitous assertions — Promises of Christ in favor of the Church — Essential and Non-essential doctrines — Bishop Whittingham — Puseyism — Palmer's division — Purity of early Church — The Age of persecution — Donatists — Striking avowal — Peter in Rome — The "Thundering Legion" — *Disciplina arcani* — Testimonies of Sts. Ignatius and Justin on holy Eucharist — Cases of Popes Victor and Stephen — The Primacy — St. Irenæus — The Cross of Constantine — Early heresies — Church of Rome — Story of Liberius and of Honorius I. — Monastic Life — Holy Virginity — Nestorius — St. Cyril of Alexandria — St. Patrick — Early British Churches — Primitive Irish Churches — St Simeon Stylites — "Rank Popery" — Early "abuses and corruptions" — Wisdom of the Church — The Seventh and Eighth General Councils.

We notice together the ecclesiastical histories of Professors Palmer and Palma, not on account of the similarity in name of the two distinguished authors, but for other obvious reasons. They have both lately given to the world the results of their respective labors in a very interesting department of human inquiry. Both, though in very different ways, have attempted to trace the various phases and vicissitudes which mark the history of the Church of Christ. Both too are men of distinguished ability and learning.

They belong to two different, and we may say opposite schools;—those of Rome and Oxford; though the latter not long since manifested some disposition to approximate to the former. And they are tolerably good representatives of these two schools. The Roman Palma, as a historian, has a character distinct in its outline and clearly marked in all its features; with a decided and unfaltering step he boldly treads the path of antiquity, with all the tortuous windings of which he is thoroughly

*I. A compendious Ecclesiastical History, from the earliest period to the present time. By the Rev. William Palmer, M. A., of Worcester College, Oxford; author of *Origines Liturgicæ*, &c., &c. With a Preface and Notes by an American Editor. New York, 1841. 1 vol. 12mo. pp. 228.

II. Prælectiones Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ, quas in Collegio Urbano Sacræ Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, et in Pontificio Seminario Romano habuit Joannes Baptista Palma, Sacerdos Romanus, Hist. Eccles. Professor. Tomi IV, 8vo. Roma, 1838 — 1840.

(Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, delivered in the Urban College of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, and in the Pontifical Seminary of Rome, by John Baptist Palma, a Roman Priest, Professor of Ecclesiastical History.

Hosted by Google

acquainted. The Oxford Palmer is less decided in his historical character; though he betrays no lack of confidence in his assertions,—else he were not a *genuine* Englishman,—yet he appears to pursue the ancient path with the uncertain air of one who hesitates, and is not well acquainted with the road. As the French would say, he is evidently *géné*;[1] he appears like a stranger in a foreign country, who would fain act as though he were at home. He belongs to a school which has manifestly been for too short a time in the remote land of antiquity, to have become naturalized to its climate, or well acquainted with its rich productions.

Nor does the contrast stop here. The two professors meet indeed on the common field of Church History, yet do they pursue routes so different, as seldom to come in contact with each other. The Roman bears "the labor of the day and the heat;" he turns up the soil, waters it with the sweat of his brow, and cultivates it with untiring industry. The Oxfordite skims lightly over its surface; gambols about its borders, culling a flower here, and plucking a fruit there; and, for the amusement or gratification of his readers, we apprehend, he often trips, falls, or turns somersets!

Dropping the figure, the Roman professor enters critically into his subject; he gives us both sides of every question which he handles; he furnishes his authorities as he proceeds; he states and refutes objections, ancient and modern: and when you have read his history, you are compelled to say, either that he has reason on his side, or at least, that his views and statements are very plausible. The Oxfordite is far from entering on any such dull and plodding labor. He would seem to consider it a bootless toil. Except scriptural quotations, and one reference to his own works, and another to the authority of the Protestant archbishop Usher, he does not, we believe, give us one single reference from the beginning to the end of his work! He furnishes many passages from the ancient documents, but he does not tell us once whence they are taken; and unless his readers are so conversant with those writings, as to be able to hunt up and examine his quotations for themselves, they must wholly rely on his bare word for their genuineness and accuracy.

This is a most serious defect. Nor let it be alleged, that such learned references are out of place in a work avowedly intended for popular use. In such books, they are perhaps more requisite than in any other, for the reason just assigned. Without some such guide, the unlearned are left wholly at the mercy of every smatterer and theorizer, who may choose to embody his peculiar views in the form of history. And this is unhappily but too often the case in popular works, especially in those written in the English language to suit the palate of Protestant readers. Of no book, perhaps, is it more true than of Palmer's Church History. If any one ever *needed* proofs in support of his assertions, he surely does, as we hope abundantly to show in the sequel.

1 Constrained — ill at ease.

Hosted by Google

For our own part, we would not give a rush for the statements of any mere partisan historian, unless they be confirmed by constant references to the original authorities. We like to have chapter and verse for every thing. We value those historical books only, the margins of which are filled with quotations of the proper documents, and the writers of which give sufficient evidence that they have not taken these authorities at second hand, but have drunk deeply themselves at the fountain heads. We like books written after the manner of Lingard's History of England. There is at least some satisfaction in reading such works. One feels that he has a guide, which he can consult in an emergency. But when there is nothing to depend on, but the mere assertions of a flippant writer, who is evidently not unbiased in his views, every impartial judge must receive such statements with distrust. They are somewhat like the tedious and over-colored narratives of a traveler, who retails his "first impressions" of a foreign country entirely from memory. They have not the weight, and they merit not the name of real history. We make these general remarks, because, as we shall see, they are fully applicable to the work of Palmer, and because in this age of specious historical theories, pompously styling themselves *philosophies of history*, one cannot be too guarded in relation to the statements he is called on to credit.

It will be easily gathered from what we have thus far said, that in comparing the Oxford Palmer with the Roman Palma, we are compelled to award the *palm* to the latter. Here we have at least one genuine *Roman* priest. All who were acquainted with him could not fail to mark his great erudition, his moderation and modesty in his statements, and his extensive learning and research. For more than twenty years, he was a distinguished professor of Church History in two of the twenty-four great colleges of Rome.[1] He became gray in this delightful study. It grew to be identified with his very being, and it was almost the idol of his devotion. He thoroughly examined all the original documents which he cites; and this minute and critical knowledge of antiquity appears on every page of his work. This learned erudition is, in fact, a distinctive characteristic of Italian writers generally; as the contrary feature,—that of superficial flippancy,—is distinctive of most English writers, and of few more so than of Palmer.

Our chief object, in this paper, is to present a summary review of the Compendious Ecclesiastical History by the Oxford Professor. But our limits will allow us merely to touch very briefly on the chief character of the work. To examine all the historian's statements, to supply all his omissions, and to correct all his errors, would require a volume much larger than the one he has given to the world. As he gives no proof whatever for anything he asserts, we would be justified in repelling

1 He became afterwards Latin Secretary of the present sovereign Pontiff, and in the disgraceful attack on the papal palace which followed the assassination of the late Count Rossi, he was shot dead by one of the assassins, almost by the side of his illustrious sovereign.

Hosted by Google

gratuitous assertion, by mere denial without proof. This would be in accordance with the well-known aphorism: *quod gratis asseritur gratis negatur* — "what is asserted gratuitously may be denied gratuitously." But we will do a Catholic work of supererogation, and supply proof as we proceed; at least as far as our limits will possibly allow.

We would not be understood as condemning indiscriminately the history of Professor Palmer. The book has many good qualities, which we greatly admire. We have been much pleased with its general plan and scope, and with the division into epochs, with, however, one exception, to which reference will soon be made. The chief excellence with which we were struck, is a certain pious vein which pervades the work, sustained by appropriate and select examples of ancient sanctity. In this feature we are delighted to recognize no little of the true Catholic spirit.

He lays down the plan of his work in the first, or introductory chapter. He says:

"The history of the Church, then, is not like other histories, in which the progress and fate of human enterprises is (*are?*) described; it is the fulfillment of God's will for the salvation of man, the accomplishment of prophecies, the triumph of grace over the imperfection and sins of nature. The perpetuity of the Church, its propagation in all nations, the succession of the true faith, the manifestation of the Holy Spirit's assistance in the lives of Christians; the calamities, errors, afflictions, which, in all ages, beset it — afford new proofs of Christianity itself, and inspire the devout mind with humility and faith." [1]

In another place, he says:

"The promises of our Lord to his Disciples, that the Spirit of Truth should lead them into all truth, and abide with them forever, that the gates of hell should not prevail against his Church, and that he himself would be always with his Disciples — imply that the faith revealed by Jesus Christ should, in every age, continue to purify and sanctify the hearts and lives of his real followers; and we may hence infer that the belief which has, *in all ages*, been derived by the Church from the holy Scriptures; the great truths which Christians have always unanimously held to be essential to the Christian profession; which have supported them under the tortures of martyrdom, and transformed them from sin to righteousness; that such doctrines are, without doubt, the very same which God himself revealed for the salvation of man." [2]

From the solemn promises of Christ just alluded to, we would infer more than suited the purpose of the Oxford divine. We would infer that the belief which was held in all ages of the Church as the revelation of God, *was* derived from, or conformable to, the holy Scriptures. If the Church, in her official capacity, could be mistaken in the understanding of the Scriptures, then were all the solemn promises of Christ of no avail, and utterly nugatory. The question would constantly recur — did the Church *actually* derive such and such doctrines from the written Word of God? And if private judgment said she did not, the principle implied by Dr. Palmer above would require that such tenets

1 Introduction, p. 4. 2 Pp. 10, 11, chap. ii.

Hosted by Google

should be rejected. He thus upsets with one hand, what he had built up with the other! Consistency is a jewel, which sparkles only on the brow of truth.

There is also, it seems to us, in the above passage, an implied assertion of the hackneyed distinction of Jurieu between essential and non-essential doctrines, the former of which must be received, and the latter may be rejected without sin. We utterly eschew this leveling principle, which opens wide the door to latitudinarianism and indifference in matters of religion. The Scriptures make no such distinction; Christ made none such, when he said: "He that believeth not, shall be condemned."[1] Whatever Christ taught and his apostles promulgated as doctrine, no matter how trivial it may seem to proud human wisdom, is equally essential to faith. Of the objects of faith, it is as true as it is of those of morals, that "he who offendeth in one is become guilty of all."[2]

We have remarked on these passages, because they afford a clue to the entire work. They exhibit the object and purpose of the writer in composing his history. And they lead us to suspect, what the perusal of the work clearly proves, that it is Church History set to Puseyism, or rather Puseyism set to Church History. The Professor started out with assuming his preconceived theory, half Catholic and half Protestant, and he consequently makes the facts of history bend to its maxims; hence his frequent blunders in point of fact, and hence the partisan spirit which evidently pervades his whole publication.

The history comes before the American reading community under the sanction and sponsorship of a distinguished individual,— no less a personage, we are given to understand, than the Right Reverend W. R. Whittingham, the Protestant Episcopal bishop of Maryland. He is the "American editor" who writes the preface and notes. We had been told, that Bishop Whittingham stood high among his brother religionists for his learning and ability. If such be the case, he has certainly given us a very poor specimen of both, in his office of American editor of Palmer. As we hope to prove hereafter, the work would have been much more accurate without his notes; and it would even have suffered very little from the omission of his preface. The notes are, almost without an exception, grossly inaccurate in point of fact; they are, in general, an attempt either to falsify the true statements of Palmer, or to make bad worse. And, like this author, he too would have us believe him on his bare word!

In his preface, he thus indorses the statements of the Oxford historian:

"A great degree of accuracy in general outline and in minute detail wherever that is given, is another admirable characteristic of Mr. Palmer's work. It has been increased, perhaps *(perhaps!)*, by the correction of one or two slips of a hasty pen, in this edition; and the minute differences, of statement or opinion, in some of the editor's additional notes, will show how thoroughly he shared in the author's anxiety to be

1 St. Mark, xvi. 2 St. James, ii, 10.

Hosted by Google

really useful — an end to be attained, in a work like this, only by the most scrupulous adherence to truth. If error as to fact be found in the book now presented to the reader, it has escaped not only the attention of the learned and indefatigable author, but the close examination of his humble and grateful fellow-laborer." [1]

We scarcely know through what kind of glasses the Protestant bishop examined Prof. Palmer's book; but they certainly favored obliquity of vision. They were probably manufactured at Oxford, and partook of the doubtful character of most other things which have recently emanated from that city. The manufacturer must have age and experience in the business, before he can hope to produce articles of real merit. If the bishop will condescend to accept our offer, made in all courtesy and kindness, we will lend him a pair of glasses, of the real Roman grinding, without a single flaw; and we assure him that through them he will be enabled to see things aright, and in a new light altogether.

By means of these same glasses, we have, at the very first glance, been able to detect more than *fifty* egregious blunders in the work, including, of course, the famous notes, nearly all of which we have been constrained to put on our black list. These errors, many of them, regard important facts; and others consist of unfair statements, or of omissions in matters of vital consequence. The sun was thought to be without spots, until the Jesuit Scheiner, or the Catholic philosopher Galileo, proved their existence by means of the telescope. Dr. Palmer's book has even more spots than the sun, though Bishop Whittingham could not discover them. And no wonder, as the Oxford glasses which he used, mystify more, and are, therefore, less serviceable than even the naked eye!

Mr. Palmer divides his history into five epochs. We will give his own language, which contains the gist of his new Puseyite theory of Church History.

"First, the ages of persecution which terminated with the accession of the Emperor Constantine to universal empire, in A. D. 320, and during which the Church was purest.

"Secondly, the ages (A. D. 320 — 680) when heresies invaded the Church, and were repelled by the six holy œcumenical synods; and when the ravages of barbarians and heathens were counterbalanced by the conversion of many nations.

"Thirdly, the period (680 — 1054) in which ignorance, worldliness, and superstition (!) began to fall thickly on the Church, though an earnest spirit of piety still continued to produce evangelists, saints, and martyrs, and to add wide regions to the Church of Christ.

"Fourthly, the times (1054 — 1517) when the east and west were estranged by the ambition of the Roman Pontiffs (!); when those bishops, elevated to the summit of temporal and spiritual power in the west, introduced numberless corruptions and innovations (!); and when their power began to fade away. (!)

"Fifthly, the epoch (1517 — 1839) when a reformation being called for, was resisted by those who ought to have promoted it (!); when the

1 Preface, p. 9.

Hosted by Google

western Church became divided; and at length infidelity came to threaten universal destruction."[1]

Here are misstatements enough surely, especially under the three last epochs. But these apart, — of which more hereafter, — we are pleased with the division, with the exception of the second epoch, which is made, whimsically enough, to terminate at the sixth general council; these six councils being all that it suited Mr. Palmer's purpose to admit, out of at least *eighteen* such assemblies, which have equal claims with those to be general councils. But the others were far too *popish* to suit the fastidious Oxford palate!

For the sake of convenience, we will briefly run over these epochs, as they come in order of time, availing ourselves of the author's admissions, supplying *some* of his many omissions, and correcting a few of his more glaring blunders as we proceed. We could not correct all; nor even half, without re-writing his whole history. Nor do we intend in our rapid sketch to forget to pay our respects, as in duty bound, to Bishop Whittingham, the Right Reverend editor and annotator.

EPOCH I, A. D. 34 — 320.[2]

During this epoch, Professor Palmer tells us that "the Church was *purest.*" We do not object to this term of praise, if it be meant only to imply, that Christians were then in general more fervent, more disengaged from the world, and more self-devoted and heroic. If it be meant to signify, that there were no moral disorders or heresies among the early Christians, or that the Church, as a Church, was then more pure in doctrine than subsequently, as would appear to be the historian's drift, then do we protest against the use of the term. The writings of the earliest fathers, and especially those of Tertullian and St. Cyprian,[3] abundantly prove, that even during the first three centuries, there were, as Christ had foretold there would be in all ages, grievous scandals to be deplored: while the five books of St. Irenæus "against heresies," and more especially the historical work of St. Epiphanius on the same subject, establish the fact, that then, as subsequently, the purity of the faith was repeatedly assailed. But the Church triumphed then, as afterwards, because Christ, her divine Spouse, had solemnly promised that she should triumph. We make these remarks, because Protestant writers, with a view to establish their preconceived theory of a defection of the Church in the fourth and following centuries, from the disorders which then occasionally prevailed, have been too much in the habit of concealing these incontestable facts, and of drawing a too highly colored picture of earlier purity.

This was emphatically a period of struggle and of persecution. The

1 *P.* 5 2 Embraced in the first six chapters, from p. 1 to p. 34.
3 In their respective treatises — *De Pœnitentia* and *De Lapsis*, and in their other works.

Hosted by Google

Church then passed through a fiery ordeal: for two hundred and fifty years the colossal power of the Roman empire was employed to crush her: the blood of her martyrs flowed like water; but like water it served to fertilize the earth! Christ triumphed in his spouse: his promises were redeemed; the "gates of hell did not prevail;" twelve poor fishermen conquered the world, and reared the cross on the proudest monuments of fallen Rome! The chief persecutors died a terrible death, so graphically painted by the eloquent Lactantius, in the fourth century.[1] Why did not our historian at least allude to this remarkable fact? His whole account in fact of the ten general persecutions,[2] is very meagre and imperfect, even for a compendious history. He, however, gives us in full the beautiful letter of the church of Smyrna, with its touching account of the martyrdom of St. Polycarp,[3] concluding with a passage which clearly proves the veneration paid, in the earliest times, to the sacred remains of the martyrs.

Speaking of the Donatists, who separated from the Church early in the fourth century, he uses this language: "These sectarians, called Donatists, were, after full examination of their cause by councils of bishops and by the emperor Constantine, universally rejected and condemned. They continued, however, for two or three centuries to disturb and persecute the Church in Africa. *Separations like these, where rival worship was established, were in those ages regarded as most heinous sins, and destructive of salvation.*"[4] This is truly a sweeping admission, extorted by the most overwhelming evidence of history. It seals the death warrant of all those separatists of modern times, who have "established rival worships," including of course the Anglican Church, which fairly comes under this category!

Among his many important omissions during the epoch under consideration, we will briefly allude to the following. He does not tell us that St. Peter went to Rome and died there; a fact to which all antiquity bears evidence,[5] and which he himself is forced afterwards to grant. He even says: "the date of St. Peter's epistle from Babylon suggests the probability of his having preached in Chaldea;"[6] whereas it is a notorious fact, admitted we think by all the learned, that Babylon of Chaldea was not then in existence. Grotius, a learned Protestant, and others, with much more probability, think that by *Babylon* St. Peter meant Pagan Rome, which St. John and the early Christians designated by that name.

He likewise makes no mention whatever of the famous miracle obtained by the prayers of the Christian legion, which served in the army of Marcus Aurelius, in his expedition against the Quadi and Marcomanni. The miracle secured victory to the imperial arms, in a most signal manner, and under the most trying circumstances. It was public and notorious; it is attested by Tertullian and Eusebius, and is established

1 De Morte Persecutorum. 2 P. 14. *et. seq.* 3 P. 16, *et. seq.* 4 P. 27.
5 Among other works on this subject, see Fogginio — *De itinere Romano et Episcopatu D. Petri* 1 vol. 4'o. — where overwhelming evidence on the subject is accumulated. 6 P. 8.

Hosted by Google

by other incontestable evidence. It was most glorious for the Christian name, and it obtained from the emperor himself for the legion the title of *legio tonans*, or thundering legion.[1]

Another omission, much more important still, is that of the *disciplina arcani*, or discipline of secret, very common in the early Church; and without which, in fact, it is almost impossible to understand the faith and worship of the epoch of which we are speaking. This discipline required caution and concealment in speaking, before pagans and the uninitiated, of the greater mysteries of the Christian faith, such as the Trinity and the Eucharist, in order not "to throw pearls before swine."[2] The unquestionable prevalence of this discipline, is a triumphant evidence of the belief in the real presence during that period.[3] Was this the reason why our historian said nothing about it?

He is himself very fond of this same discipline of secret, in regard to those things which he did not find it expedient to state, because they might be opposed to his theory. Thus he tells us "of the Gnostics and Manicheans,[4] who held that our Lord's body was not real, but a mere phantom, and that he did not die on the cross;"[5] but he forgot to give us this testimony of St. Ignatius, martyr, bearing directly on the subject: "they (the Gnostics) abstain from the Eucharist and from prayer, because they do not acknowledge the Eucharist *to be the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins, and which the Father by his goodness resuscitated.*"[6]

We should be endless, were we to attempt to supply all his important omissions in this way. For once, however, he violates the discipline of secret, and gives us pretty correctly the famous testimony of St. Justin, martyr, on the holy Eucharist. The philosopher martyr had set him the example for this violation, as he had found it necessary, for the defense of Christianity against the base slanders of its enemies, to speak out plainly on the belief of the early Christians upon this subject,—too plainly as we shall see to suit the taste of our Oxford divine. Here are his words as cited by Mr. Palmer: "We do not receive it (the Eucharist) as common bread or common drink; but as, by the word of God, our Savior Jesus Christ was incarnate, and had flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we have been instructed that the food, blessed by the word of prayer which is from him, through which our flesh and blood by a change are nourished, is (spiritually) the flesh and blood of that incarnate Jesus."[7]

That word *spiritually*, it is almost needless to say, came from Oxford;

1 For a full account and vindication of this miracle, see Palma, *Prælectiones*. vol. i, P. 1, p. 76, *et seq.* c. xiv.

2 Palma, ibid. p. 82, *et seq.* The best thing on the subject is perhaps the learned dissertation of Schelestrate — *De Disciplina Arcani.*

3 See "Faith of Catholics," vol. ii, p. 158, seqq., Edition of Dolman, London, 1846; in 3 vols. 8vo. See also the "Amicable Discussion."

4 We greatly doubt whether the Manicheans taught any such thing. 5 P. 135.

6 Epistola ad Smyrnæos, p. 36, tom. ii, PP. Apostolic. Amstelodami, 1724.

7 The passage is taken from an apology (the first) of St. Justin to the Roman emperor and senate — though it might be taken from any other of St Justin's writings, for all Mr. Palmer tells us.

Hosted by Google

and like many other things that have lately come from Oxford, it makes arrant nonsense. It makes St. Justin say, that as Christ took flesh *really*, so "the food," &c. becomes his flesh *spiritually!* Why was that word interjected at all, unless it was thought and *felt*, that the sense would be very different without it? Are we to give credit to Mr. Palmer for this interpolation, or is it "a hasty slip of the pen," by his Right Reverend editor and commentator?

The errors of our historian in point of fact, though not so numerous in this as in the subsequent epochs of his history, yet are frequent. He seems to have an instinctive dislike for the bishops of Rome, and wherever they are concerned, you may expect from him little accuracy or fairness. Thus he tells us roundly, that Victor, bishop of Rome, towards the close of the second century, "proceeded to the extent of separating them (the Asiatics) from his communion; an act," he continues, "which was disapproved of by St. Irenæus and the greater part of the Church."[1] It is much more probable, to say the least, that Victor merely threatened excommunication, and was dissuaded from carrying his threat into execution, as he had the power to do, by the arguments of St. Irenæus. It is not true that "the greater part of the Church disapproved of his conduct." He was certainly in the right, and the general council of Nice, in 325, which we apprehend represented "the greater part of the Church," decided that he was right, and excommunicated all who would thereafter persist in the practice adopted by the Asiatics.[2]

His account of the controversy between St. Stephen and St. Cyprian, on re-baptizing those baptized by heretics, is yet more glaringly inaccurate. He tells us, that "Stephen insisted that the custom of the Roman Church should be adopted, and separated the African churches, on their refusal, from his communion. This act, however, was not approved or recognized by the majority of bishops."[3] . The contrary is the fact. St. Augustine tells us that Cyprian "continued in the peace of unity with St. Stephen:"[4] and St. Jerome says the same.[5] Their testimony is at least as good as Mr. Palmer's flippant assertions. And as to the majority of bishops having been opposed to Stephen, it is utterly false, and we challenge proof to the contrary. St. Augustine assures us, in many places of his voluminous writings on the subject, that a "plenary council" decided in favor of Stephen, and that the whole Church agreed with him. At the time of the controversy itself, numerous councils were held in various parts of the Church, which approved of the course adopted by the Roman Pontiff.[6]

By the way, it is a singular fact, that, in some way or other, the Roman Pontiffs, from the earliest days of the Church, *always* triumphed because they always happened to be right: and their triumph in the persons of Victor and Stephen is a conclusive proof that the primacy

1 P. 25. 2 See Palma, *Prælectiones*, vol. i, P. 1, p. 206, *et seq.* for all the documents on this subject
3 P. 26. 4 De Baptismo, lib. iv, c. 25—"Eum in unitatis pace cum eo permansisse."
5 Dialog adversus Luciferianos. 6 Palma, vol i, P. 1, p. 163, *et seq.*, and p. 142, *et seq.*

Hosted by Google

was then recognized. Else why would men so holy have ever thought of excommunicating churches in Africa and Asia? And why did not the Church protest against this usurpation, if it was an usurpation? In both those controversies, it is remarkable that the opponents of the Pontiffs never once thought of questioning their *right* or *power* to excommunicate: they merely deprecated its exercise. If Mr. Palmer is so much pleased with the practice of the Asiatics in keeping Easter, why does not his Church now adopt it, instead of the contrary one of Rome?

These facts may enable us to judge, what credit is due to the assertion of our historian, that though "some churches had pre-eminent distinction on account of their opulence and magnitude," yet "all bishops and churches, however, were regarded as perfectly equal in the sight of God, (*and of men?*) and regulated their own affairs, and exercised discipline with perfect freedom."[1] The testimony of Irenæus, and the voice of all antiquity, trace the pre-eminence of certain churches to other causes altogether, than those carnal-minded ones assigned by Mr. Palmer. They tells us, that the Roman see was the "chair of Peter;" that the second in pre-eminence, that of Alexandria, was founded by Peter's disciple, Mark; and that the third, Antioch, was Peter's see, before he removed to Rome. A volume might be filled with testimonies to prove that the Roman Pontiffs held the primacy from the beginning of the Church. Archbishop Kenrick's triumphant work on the Primacy is a tissue of such authorities. Would not Bishop Whittingham do well to edit this work also "with notes?" It is an answer to a publication by one of his own brother bishops, and it yet remains, perhaps for a very obvious reason, unanswered.

By the by, we have little fault to find with the bishop's notes under this epoch: but we suppose it is chiefly because he has been very reserved. There is, however, a little note of his on page 23, in which he corrects a *true* statement of Palmer, who had asserted in the text that "Irenæus was crowned with martyrdom." The episcopal annotator here remarks: "so some think, but without sufficient evidence." We know not what new light has been shed on the bishop's mind, or what evidence he would deem sufficient. We find the fact stated in every Church historian within our reach, and we know it is the basis of a very old and general Church office. It has ever been the belief of the Church of Lyons, which keeps the feast of the martyr on the 28th of June. Though it is a matter comparatively unimportant, we are really curious to know what facts can be brought to prove, that Irenæus did not die a martyr under Septimius Severus.

We might remark on many other inaccuracies under this first epoch; but the subjects will recur in the sequel, and we must hasten on. We merely pause to notice, in passing, our author's singular method of accounting for the conversion of the emperor Constantine. He says:

"So great was the progress of religion, notwithstanding the violent

1 P. 33.

Hosted by Google

and cruel persecutions to which it was continually exposed, that it became no less the interest than the duty of the first Christian emperor, Constantine the Great, to relieve the Church from persecution, to act as the defender of its faith, and to distinguish its ministers and members by marks of his favor and generosity."

We had thought, in our simplicity, that Constantine the Great was actuated by much higher and purer motives than interest. We had read in Eusebius, a cotemporary historian of high repute, of a magnificent cross which appeared to him at noon-day in the heavens, bearing the motto: "εν τουτω νικα" — IN THIS CONQUER; and that Constantine had made a banner like it, called the *Labarum*, which beckoned him on to victory.[1] We had read all this; but we suppose that if Eusebius had chanced to be born in Oxford in these latter days, this and all other heavenly visions would have vanished from his disenchanted eyes! Well, we admire the march of mind, and the progress of enlightenment!

EPOCH II, A. D. 320—680.[2]

This was, in a more particular manner, the epoch of struggles with, and triumphs over heresy. During this period the Church saw Arianism, Macedonianism, Nestorianism, Eutychianism, Pelagianism, and Monothelitism, rise in succession, create great disturbances for a time, and then sink again in the bosom of that darkness from which they had emerged. All of these formidable heresies, except Pelagianism, originated among the subtle and disputatious Greeks of the Eastern church. Rome proscribed them all; and then, as ever since, the voice of Rome was re-echoed through the world by the great body of bishops. During this period, as always, the successor of Peter continued to fulfill the divine injunctions: "Feed my lambs; feed my sheep."[3] "And thou (Peter) being once converted, confirm thy brethren."[4] The Lord Jesus had "prayed for Peter that his faith might not fail."[5] And, accordingly, St. Cyprian, in the third century, assures us that "heretical perfidy never could have access to the chair of Peter, the principal Church, *whence the sacerdotal unity took its rise.*"[6] All ancient Church History proclaims this remarkable fact, that the Roman Pontiffs, in all the controversies of those times, were ever in the right in their official capacity.

It is by some considered as doubtful, whether the story of the fall of Pope Liberius be well founded. If he subscribed any formulary of faith different from that of Nice, it is *certain*, that such formulary was not heretical, but merely defective; and that he was induced to yield thus far, while under restraint, and after his spirit had been broken by a two

1 See a critical examination of the whole matter in Palma, vol. i, P. II, p. 32, *et seq.*
2 From p. 34—74. 3 St. John, xxi, 15—17. 4 Luke, xxii, 32.
5 Luke xxii, 32. 6 Epist. lv, p. 86.

Hosted by Google

years' rigorous confinement. Whatever he did, he did it in his private capacity alone, and not as the pastor of the universal Church. As soon as he recovered his liberty, it is admitted on all hands, that, he became a most staunch defender of the Church against Arianism [1] The most ardent advocates of papal prerogative never once dreamed of asserting that the Pope, as a private individual, is either impeccable or infallible.

The only other Pontiff who has been charged with heresy, with any appearance of plausibility, is Honorius I., who, it is alleged, was condemned as a heretic in the sixth œcumenical council, held in 680, the last year of the present epoch. Mr. Palmer [2] evidently chuckles over the supposed fall of this Pontiff. But it is not even pretended, that Honorius actually defined anything against Catholic faith; his whole fault, if it was a fault, consisted in enjoining silence on the disputants at the first commencement of the controversy. His epistles to Sergius, bishop of Constantinople, clearly establish this. The wily Greek had misrepresented the real state of the controversy, and had deceived the unsuspecting Pontiff. The result was unfortunate, as the enemies of the faith, among whom Sergius was the chief, carefully availed themselves of the disciplinary injunction of the Pontiff, to spread their heresy in the East. And this reason, no doubt, prompted the council to condemn Honorius, as a favorer of heretics. This council was composed almost entirely of Greek bishops, whose bosoms were already swayed by a rising jealousy of Rome; which feeling, a little later, led them into open schism: [3] and there is no evidence, that the incidental charge against Honorius was ever approved by the Western Church.

Our historian thus speaks of the origin of the monastic life: — the Italics are ours.

"Many of the most truly pious and holy men whom those ages produced, were among those who lived retired from the world, and who were engaged solely in the service of God. A life entirely devoted to religion, and separated from all domestic cares, pleasures, and occupations, had been the characteristic of the ascetics and virgins *even from the time of the apostles;* but the monastic or solitary life was first exhibited on a broad scale by Anthony and his disciples in Egypt, at the latter end of the third, and the beginning of the fourth century." [4]

"In the present age," he adds, "it is, perhaps, difficult to appreciate justly the religious character of ascetic religion in the early Church." [5] This is, alas! but too true. Protestantism never had any relish for this life of prayer and self-denial; these are not palatable to our modern religionists' dainty taste.

The historian's admission, in regard to the antiquity of the ascetics and sacred virgins, was too much for his Right Reverend editor; who,

1 For full evidence on this subject, see Palma, vol. i, P. II, p. 94, *et seq.*, and p. 103, *et seq.*

2 Page 47.

3 Palma treats the whole subject with his usual learning and ability, vol. ii, P. I, p. 104, *et seq.*

4 Page 49. 5 Ibid.

Hosted by Google

breathing a more anti-popery atmosphere, is not yet prepared to go as far Romeward, even as Professor Palmer. In a note, he very sagely remarks, that "these (ascetics and virgins) certainly did not exist as distinct classes before the end of the second century; nor even then in anything resembling the form of monkery." The end of the second century is a very respectable antiquity of itself: but would not the avowed fact of their general existence in the second century, argue a more ancient origin? What would the bishop think of the argument, that because we find mention of the order of bishops in writers of the second century, therefore this order had *certainly* no previous existence? Yet his is precisely parallel.

Both Tertullian[1] and St. Cyprian[2] wrote treatises expressly on the duties of sacred virgins; which clearly proves their recognized existence, as a distinct class in the second and third centuries, and also establishes their prior origin. As to the "form of monkery," we will not dispute about forms, so the substance be admitted. In the first century, the Therapeutes of the East were a species of monks; and the order of sacred virgins existed from the days of the apostles. We read in the Acts, that Philip the Evangelist "had four daughters virgins, who did prophesy;"[3] and the seventh chapter of St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians clearly implies the apostolical origin of holy virgins and celibataries. Carnal-minded Protestantism can not understand or appreciate all this. In our modern systems of religion, matrimony seems to constitute the *summum bonum*, and virginity is almost as much despised as it was among the heathens of old! Who will venture to deny this?

Among the many important omissions of our author under this epoch, we have time to mention only one. He says nothing of the attempt made by Julian, the apostate, to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, with the avowed purpose of falsifying the predictions of Christ; nor of the miraculous manner in which that attempt was frustrated by God. Yet this is perhaps one of the most triumphant proofs of the divinity of the Christian Religion, and it should not therefore have been omitted, even in a compendious history. The fact is testified to by all Christian antiquity; and it is vouched for even by the cotemporary pagan historian, Ammianus Marcellinus, a great admirer of Julian.[4]

The errors and misstatements of our author and of his editor are here so numerous, that we scarcely have space to advert even transiently to the principal of them. On pages 43, 44, we have no less than three notes, in which Bishop Whittingham corrects *true* statements made in the text. Mr. Palmer calls Nestorius "a vain and arrogant man," and gives a correct account of his heresy. The episcopal commentator here remarks: "Nestorius hardly has justice done him by this statement . . . the most accurate investigations leave little room for doubt, that he did not teach the heretical doctrine afterwards put forth by some who took part in the

1 De Velandis Virginibus. 2 De Virginibus
3 Acts, xxi, 9. 4 Apud Palma, vol. i, P. II, p. 23, *et seq.*

Hosted by Google

dispute, and bore his name." Ah indeed! So the Protestant bishop of Maryland has, "by his more accurate investigations," ascertained more than had been found out by the two hundred bishops who composed the council of Ephesus, and by nearly all the historians of antiquity! We give him credit for his wonderful discovery: but until he gives us some *facts* on the subject, we must be pardoned for believing that Nestorius was a heretic.[1]

The second *correction* to which we just alluded, is the substitution in the note of the word *testimony*, for that of the *decision* of the council of Ephesus against Nestorius. The bishop is evidently alarmed at the spectre of church authority *deciding* on controversy. Feeling that his own church is powerless, *even to silence a recreant parson*, he would fain snatch from the ancient Church also her spiritual armor of authoritative teaching.

The third *correction* contains a libel on St. Cyril of Alexandria, who, in the text, had been praised as having had "the honor of being the principal opponent of this heresy" (the Nestorian). The editor adds: "but not without sullying himself with the use of very unbefitting means." Here also he flatly contradicts all Christian antiquity.

Again, the historian speaks of St. Patrick and St. Palladius, the respective apostles of Ireland and Scotland, though singularly enough he makes them both the apostles of Ireland; and we are sure the Irish will thank him for the discovery!

"The apostolical labors of St. Patrick were rewarded by the conversion of the Irish nation to Christianity. Palladius had been previously ordained to the same mission by Cœlestinus, bishop of Rome," &c.[2]

Not at all, says the episcopal editor:

"This is extremely doubtful, or rather almost certainly untrue. That both Palladius and Patrick preached in Ireland, early in the fifth century, is certain."

If Palladius visited Ireland, he remained but a short time.[3] But the bishop further observes:

"That neither of them had any direct communication with Rome is in the highest degree probable."

And yet St. Prosper, a cotemporary historian, testifies in his chronicle, that Palladius was ordained by Pope Cœlestine for the Scotch.[4] Which are we to believe? All the ancient authors of St. Patrick's life agree in stating, that after his second captivity, he traveled through France and

1 Another instance of the sympathy of errorists for one another, is furnished by the great parade lately made over a Nestorian bishop, whom the Rev. Justus Perkins brought to this country as a kind of show! 2 P. 45.

3 We are aware that the words *Scoti* and *Hiberni* were interchangeable terms for several centuries: yet St. Patrick, in his confessions, clearly distinguishes between them, and so do other ancient documents. The learned Alban Butler thinks that the Scots first settled in Ireland, and then removed to Scotland. See Butler's lives of Saints, 17th March, *note*. Dublin edition.

4 "Ad Scotos in Christum credentes ordinatur a Papa Cœlestino Palladius, et primus episcopus mittitur." — *Chronicon. ad annum* 431. The Chronicle begins with Adam, and comes down to the year 455, and it is very good authority, especially against a mere assertion.

Hosted by Google

Italy, visited Rome, and received his mission, together with the apostolical benediction, from Pope Cœlestine, who died A. D. 432.[1]

Speaking of the ancient British and Irish churches, Mr. Palmer makes this reckless assertion :

"The ancient churches of the Britons which still continued, as well as the Irish churches, were not subject to the jurisdiction of the bishops of Rome, nor was the Anglo-Saxon Church for many centuries, though much reverence was felt for the ancient and celebrated Church of Rome, and much assistance derived from it in the earlier stages of their existence."[2]

And again :

"The ancient British and Irish churches, in the sixth and seventh centuries, were treated as schismatics by the Roman church in consequence of their adherence to their ancient customs, and for not submitting to the authority of the papal see ; but they were acknowledged as Christians by many churches."[3]

And to make bad worse, the bishop of Maryland adds this note about the "ancient customs : "

"For which they *truly* pleaded apostolical warrant, in the practice of St. John, derived to them through the churches of Gaul."

It would require too much space to refute all the misstatements contained in these remarkable passages, which are selected almost at random, from many more of a similar kind. We will barely enumerate them, and say a word or two on each.

1. The ancient British and Irish churches *were* subject to the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiffs, as a host of facts clearly show ; and we challenge proof to the contrary. In both, Christianity and its first teachers had come from Rome. At the close of the second century, Pope Eleutherius (about 180) had sent to England Fugatius and Damianus, at the instance of King Lucius. This is attested by all the older British writers.[4] Whether, previously to this time, the gospel was preached, at least to any extent, in England or not, is doubtful ; but if it was, it had made but few disciples.[5] But for Rome, England would perhaps never have been converted. Besides, the primacy apart, England was in the western patriarchate, and under this title, like the other western churches, was subject to the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiffs, who were also avowedly patriarchs of the west.

2. That the Irish churches were ever treated as schismatical by Rome, is an assertion unsustained by proof. The Irish church was never for a moment stained with either heresy or schism.

1 So says Probus, who wrote a life of the saint, according to Bollandus, some time in the seventh century. The Cistercian monk, Jocelin, who also wrote his life in the twelfth century, and who refers to four different lives of the saint written before his time, relates the same fact. See Butler's Lives of Saints, 17th March, Dublin edition. Surely all this testimony should outweigh the bare assertion of Bishop Whittingham. 2 P. 46. 3 P 67.

4 For facts see Lingard — "Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon church," p. 18, American edition.

5 Idem, p. 17, *note*.

Hosted by Google

3. The British churches never refused to admit the authority of the papal see. The controversy did not turn on this point. They merely refused to submit to St. Augustine, because he could not sanction their customs, and would not brook their notorious immorality, attested by all cotemporary writers. The testimony of Gildas, an historian of the time, clearly proves that they acknowledged the authority of the Roman Pontiffs, even after that authority had proscribed them : for their clergy still went to Rome to obtain ecclesiastical preferment.[1]

4. The British churches did not "*truly* plead apostolical warrant for their customs," as Bishop Whittingham says ; nor did they plead it at all. They merely alleged the example of St. Columban and of their forefathers. St. John and the churches of Gaul had nothing to do with the controversy. It is ascertained that the British churches were not *quartodecimans*, or did not persist in keeping Easter with the Jews. They merely refused to adopt the improvement in the calendar introduced by Dionysius Exiguus, and already adopted by Rome and the whole Church. The venerable Bede tells us, that their remoteness from the rest of the world was the reason of their ignorant adherence to an erroneous calendar.[2] By the way, as Bishop Whittingham so greatly admires those "ancient customs," why does he not adopt them, and shave his own head in the form of a crescent ? In this strange plight, and keeping Easter about a month sooner or later than his brethren, he would certainly excite admiration ! He would be a glorious reformer, "*truly* pleading apostolical warrant!"

5. We would much like to see any evidence going to prove, that after their separation from Rome, "the British churches were acknowledged as Christians by many churches." We doubt whether there is *one* fact in history to warrant this assertion.

6. That the Anglo-Saxon church acknowledged the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiffs, from the time of St. Augustine to the reformation, could be proved by a whole volume of evidence. But our space will not allow us even to touch on this subject.[3]

Professor Palmer gives us some very fine sketches of St. Anthony, of St. Pachomius, of St. Martin, and of many other principal saints and illustrious ornaments of this period.[4] They are judicious, well selected, and edifying ; written too in the right spirit. He even speaks with great praise of that remarkable man, St. Simeon Stylites,[5] who passed many years of his life on the top of a column, in order to escape the importunity of the multitudes who flocked to him for his blessing. He tells us how this holy man was venerated by emperors, empresses, and bishops; and how he converted thousand of pagans to the Christian faith. He gives this opinion of his character :

1 This whole subject is ably handled by Lingard. Ibid. p. 41, *et seq.*

2 "Utpote qui longe extra orbem positis nemo synodalia Paschalis observantiæ decreta porrexerat." — lib. iii, c. 4.

3 For facts and authorities on this interesting subject, we refer the reader to Dr. Kenrick on the Primacy Part I, ch. xvi; also to the late eloquent work of Dr. Ives — "Trials of a mind," &c.

4 P. 44, *et. seq.* 5 P. 55, 56.

Hosted by Google

"An example of want of moderation in self-denial and mortification is frequently pointed out in the case of St. Simeon Stylites, who lived in the fifth century. Yet it is impossible not to admit that, with some excesses in these respects, there was much to admire and venerate in his character."[1]

This eulogy did not suit the taste of the Episcopal editor. He says, in a note:

"The excesses of Simeon were more reprehensible than mere 'want of moderation in self-denial and mortification.' His multiplied bowings, protracted watchings, constrained postures, and pillar-isolation, belong to a low class of superstition, and furnish a melancholy proof of the degenerating tendencies of the age."

The Protestant bishop is far too enlightened to relish these same "multiplied bowings and protracted watchings;" as to the "constrained postures," his very soul abhors them. Only think of the "degenerating tendencies of the age!" Rank popery perched on a pillar, surrounded by admiring thousands, in the middle of the fifth century! It is really too bad! It is absolutely shocking to the nerves of a delicate Protestant bishop, even to think of those austerities! To be more serious: the example of St. Simeon is extraordinary, and almost single in Church History. It belongs to the class of things admirable, but not imitable. In those warm Eastern climates, it was not unusual, at that day, for persons to pass considerable portions of their lives in the open air, or on the terraces of their houses. The manner of life of St. Simeon was, then, after all, not so very great a departure from the usage of his time and country, as might appear at first sight. We make these remarks merely to steady the bishop's nerves.

Dr. Palmer devotes an entire chapter[2] to what he styles "the rise of abuses and corruptions." This chapter is a tissue of unfounded assertion and of special pleading, from beginning to end. It is bad enough already; and hence the bishop makes no notes. It would far transcend our limits to enter into a detailed refutation of its glaring perversion of facts and evidence. On one page alone, we have marked no less than four false statements, for the refutation of each of which, however, a separate paper would be necessary. We will offer only a few general remarks.

The gist of the reasoning consists in the assertion, that many doctrines, —invocation of saints, veneration for relics, purgatory, and others,— led to great abuses; and in the inference thence drawn, that they were, therefore, rightly repudiated by Protestants. The things were good in their origin and harmless in themselves; they were subsequently abused; therefore, they were justly abolished. Under this leveling reasoning, everything in Christianity, and the bible itself would be swept away. He says:

"Could the pious fathers of the fourth century, who in their orations

1 P. 55. 2 Chap. x. p. 68, *et seq.*

Hosted by Google

apostrophized the departed saints and martyrs, and called for their prayers to God, have foreseen the abuses to which this practice was to lead, . . . they would carefully have avoided the introduction of a practice so dangerous to true religion."

Could they now rise from their graves, how they would rebuke those, who, under pretence of promoting true religion, have mutilated or rejected the practices which they so much cherished! How they would be charmed too with the motley appearance of modern Protestantism! According to our Oxford divine, even the Church, sustained, as he delights to repeat it was, by the promises of Christ, was yet wanting in knowledge on this subject:

"The Church has not always been gifted with a spirit of wisdom and foreknowledge, to discern the future abuses of opinions and practices, which it originally permitted without reproof." [1]

For our parts, we greatly prefer the wisdom of the Church, which Christ promised to protect from error, and which he commanded us to hear, to the new-fangled and mystical notions of Oxford. It may be childish simplicity in us; but if we err in hearing the Church, we err by the express command of Christ!

Professor Palmer will not admit, that either the seventh or the eighth council was œcumenical, or general. The former condemned the Iconoclasts, and maintained the lawfulness of images in churches; the latter condemned the intruder Photius, that ambitious man who had been consecrated bishop of Constantinople in six days from being a mere layman, while St. Ignatius, the lawful bishop, was still living. He tells us, that the former was rejected by the Western, and the latter by the Eastern church.[2] Neither of these assertions is true, as we could easily accumulate evidence to prove, did our limits permit. The Roman Pontiffs certainly sanctioned the canons of the seventh council, or the second of Nice, held in 787. And with them the bulk of the Western bishops certainly agreed, at least after a brief hesitancy. The fathers of the council at Frankfort, in 794, merely labored under an error of fact, founded on a false version of the Nicene canons: this error was subsequently removed, and the Western bishops then gave in their adhesion.

What the bishops of the Greek church may have thought on the subject after their final rupture with Rome under Michael Cerularius, is not important: but during the two centuries intervening between the holding of the eighth general council and this final schism, they had certainly, at least a majority of them, received its decisions.[3] There is, in a word, as much evidence to prove that these councils are œcumenical, as there is to prove the same of the six preceding ones, which our

1 Pages 68. 69. 2 Page 47.

3 See Palma, vol. ii, part ii, p. 15, *et seq.*, and p. 26, *et seq*, and ibid, p. 89, *et seq.*, and p. 114, *et seq.*, for full proofs on the subject of the seventh and eighth general councils.

Hosted by Google

author receives. Objections had been made to all of them for a time; but they were all finally sanctioned by the body of bishops.

We have now finished our remarks on this epoch; and with them we also close this paper. We have not noticed one-half the passages we had marked for animadversion; but the few specimens we have been able to give will serve to show the general character for accuracy of Mr. Palmer's work, as also that of its Right Reverend editor. Our readers will probably concur with us in opinion, that Bishop Whittingham might have been much better employed, than in writing notes on Palmer's Church History. He might, for instance, have devoted his leisure moments to an answer to Archbishop Kenrick's book on the Primacy.

Hosted by Google

II. CHURCH HISTORY.*

ARTICLE II. — THE MIDDLE AGES.

A different Division suggested — Triumphs of the Church over Barbarism — Missionaries sent by Rome — The Ages of Faith — Auricular Confession — Testimonies of Tertullian and St. Cyprian — Nectarius and the Penitentiary — Puseyite View of the Holy Eucharist — Paschasius Radbert and Berengarius — Temporal Authority of the Pope and Bishops — Decretals of Isidore — Prerogatives of the Roman Pontiffs — Pope Julius I. — Greek Schism — Order of Pre-eminence — Michael Cerularius — Shaving the Beard — The Nicene Canons — Edifying Incident of St. Anselm — Modern Anglican Parsons — Vision of "Roman attempts at Usurpation" — Have the Promises of Christ failed? — The Roman Primacy acknowledged by the early Greek Church — And at Councils of Lyons and Florence — When was the Doctrine of the Primacy Defined? — Purgatory — Transubstantiation — Indulgences — Protestant *Indulgences* — Penitential Works — Repudiating the Debt — The Rosary — "The Pure and Holy One" — Temporal power of the Popes — Its influence on Civilization.

In our first paper, we extended our review of Mr. Palmer's work to the beginning of the third epoch of Church History, according to his division. In the present, we intend to offer some remarks upon the third and fourth epochs, which bring the history down to the reformation. To the period which has elapsed since this eventful revolution, we will have to devote a separate paper, which will be the last of this series.

We have already intimated that we did not approve of the idea of our author, which makes the year 680, — the date of the seventh general council, against the Monothelites, — a distinct era in Church History, on the ground that this was the *last* general council. We have briefly shown how unfounded is this assumption. We would have greatly preferred a less whimsical, and more rational division, and one, at the same time, more conformable to the great vicissitudes of ecclesiastical history. We would have divided the period which elapsed from the accession of Constantine the Great, as sole emperor, in the year 324, to the reformation in 1517, into four, instead of three epochs.

The first would have terminated with the fall of the Roman empire in the west, in the year 476, — an event of sufficient importance, surely, both in general and ecclesiastical history, to form a distinct epoch. This period, embracing one hundred and fifty-two years, witnessed the rise, progress, and condemnation of the four great heresies against the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and of the Incarnation; as well as the holding of the first four general councils, which St. Gregory 1. and the ancient fathers

* *A Compendious Ecclesiastical History, from the earliest period to the present time.* By the Rev. William Palmer, M. A., of Worcester College, Oxford. With a Preface and Notes, by an American Editor. New York, 1841, republished. 1 vol. 12mo. pp. 228.

Hosted by Google

revered as they did the four gospels. The second epoch would have closed with the crowning of Charlemagne, in the beginning of the ninth century, and it would have traced the first great struggle of the Church with barbarism, and her first successful efforts for the conversion of the northern nations. The third epoch would have closed with the consummation of the Greek schism under Michael Cerularius, in 1054; and it would have unfolded the triumphant termination of the struggles and efforts just alluded to. Finally, the fourth epoch would have terminated with the reformation; and it would have coincided with that of our author. This division seems to us more in conformity with the great phases of Church History. We will, however, continue our remarks on the division into epochs adopted by our Oxford historian.

EPOCH III, A. D 680 — 1054.[1]

This was, in a special manner, the period of the triumph of the Church over barbarism, in the conversion of the northern nations. Mr. Palmer gives us[2] a very brief and imperfect summary of facts on this subject; but he almost forgets to inform us, that the credit of those glorious triumphs is mainly due to the Roman Pontiffs. He merely tells us incidentally, that "at length Boniface went to Rome, by desire of Pope Gregory II., who ordained him bishop for the mission among the heathens east of the Rhine."[3] He might have told us the same of all the great apostles of the north, who were either sent directly by Rome, or who at least undertook their apostolical labors with the approval of the Roman Pontiffs. Even M. D'Aubigné, the unscrupulous Protestant historian of the reformation, admits as much. He informs us, that "the Germans had received from Rome that element of modern civilization, the faith. Instruction, legislation; ALL, save their courage and their weapons, had come to them from the sacerdotal city. Strong ties had, from that time, attached Germany to the papacy."[4]

We shall soon have occasion to see, in what language our author speaks of the abuses and corruptions of this period, in doing which he but re-echoes the stereotyped charges of prejudiced and partisan historians. As an offset to these accusations, and at the same time as a specimen of the admirable consistency of Puseyism, we will first give some of his admissions on the faith and piety of those much abused ages. In regard to the faith then prevalent he speaks thus:

"The same great truths of religion were universally adopted; the same Scriptures were diligently studied by all who had the means of doing so, — for in those days, before the invention of printing, when all books were transcribed by manual labor, they were both scarce and

1 From p. 76 — 106. 2 P. 75, *et. seq.* 3 P. 89.
4 "History of the Great Reformation," &c., in three volumes, 12mo. vol. 1, pp. 78, 79. Edit Carter, New York, 1843

Hosted by Google

expensive; and an universal appeal was made to the sentiments of the ancient fathers and councils in the interpretation of the Bible."[1]

In the very chapter in which he treats of the "abuses and superstitions" of the period under consideration, he has the following admission in regard to the state of religion at that time:

"And if, as we have reason to believe, a large portion of the community were (*was?*) accustomed to receive the holy eucharist three times a year, we may trust that the state of religion was in those ages not so bad as it has been sometimes represented; and the present age, with all its advantages of civilization, peace, and education, would perhaps scarcely be able to prove its greater attention to known duties, or its more conscientious obedience to the impulse of conscience."[2]

From the following extract it would clearly appear, that, even in his opinion, those ages of faith were far ahead of the present enlightened times in piety and devotion:—

"Nor has there ever been a period in the history of the Church, when the spirit of religion, where it existed, was more ardent and earnest. The religion of those times was less learned, less accomplished (!) less free from superstition (!), than that of earlier ages; but it can scarcely be said to have been less zealous, less productive of good works. Its characteristics were the deepest humility, renouncement of self, denial of the passions and even of the enjoyments and pleasures of the world; boundless charity to the poor; the foundation of churches, schools, and religious houses; diligent study of the Scriptures, singing of psalms, and much prayer. We see not merely one or two, but hundreds of men forsaking all their earthly prospects, the resorts of their youth, and the paths of ambition, to devote themselves to the conversion of the heathen. We see them desiring and rejoicing to die for Christ; and, by their patience, piety, and wisdom, bringing multitudes of heathens into the way of salvation. We see many of the most powerful monarchs engaged in all the exercises of continual devotion and charity, or descending from the summit of earthly grandeur to spend the remainder of their days in penitence and prayer. However sad may have been the calamities of the Church, and however great the faults of Christians, yet when we see such things as these, we cannot refrain from the conviction that the Spirit of God was still influencing the hearts of many people; nor fail to perceive that the Lord was still, according to his promise, always with his Church."[3]

The tree which produced such fruits as these must have been good, according to the rule of our Lord: "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Our historian confirms the truth of this admirable picture, by appropriate and well written sketches of the lives of many illustrious men who flourished during the period in question: of the Venerable Bede, of Charlemagne, of St. Boniface, of the martyrs of Amorium at Bagdat, of Alfred the Great, and of the anchorite, St. Nilus.[4] These examples are so well exhibited, that we are restrained only by our narrow limits from making our readers sharers in the unmingled pleasure we had in perusing them.

All that surprises us, is, that the Protestant bishop of Maryland did

1 Page 78. 2 Page 101. 3 Page 85 4 Pp 85—100.

Hosted by Google

not endeavor to mar the beauty of these sketches by the introduction of a few of his *little* notes! Perhaps the good bishop deemed this a work of supererogation, since Mr. Palmer, here as elsewhere, takes special pains to spoil his own work. He seizes the brush, and recklessly bedaubs his own picture, until scarcely a lineament of its former beauty remains.

Confession was one of the cherished practices of medieval piety. It was this great act of self denial which prepared the sainted men and women of that period for the heroic sacrifices which excite the admiration of our historian; — sacrifices to which, by the way, cold and lifeless Protestantism can offer no parallel. Let us see how our Oxfordite discourses on this subject:

"During these ages, the practice of private confession to a priest was not held generally to be a matter of necessity. We have already seen this custom abolished (as a pre-requisite to the reception of the Eucharist) in the east, by Nectarius, patriarch of Constantinople, in the fourth century, and by the majority of the eastern church. It was still practiced in many parts of the west, but was not regarded as an essential of religion. Bede and Alcuin recommended Christians to confess to the ministers of God all the grievous sins which they could remember. But others, as we learn from Alcuin and Haymo, would not confess their sins to the priest," &c.[1]

We would ask, do Protestant preachers now-a-days, with Bede and Alcuin, "recommend Christians to confess to the ministers of God *all* the grievous sins which they can remember?" Or rather, do they not inveigh, in season and out of season, against this whole practice of confession, as popish and encouraging sin? Do not the parsons of the church of England also join in the general outcry, although their own Prayer Book, in the order for the visitation of the sick, strongly recommends the practice?[2] Do they not rather belong to that class of negligent Christians, whom Alcuin and Haymo reproached, because "they *would not* confess their sins to the priest?" Catholic priests, at the present day, often feel it to be their duty to make a similar reproach to negligent Catholics, which fact, instead of disproving the general belief in the obligation of confession among them, on the contrary, clearly establishes its recognized existence.

The whole statement just given, is, in fact, untrue and unfair from beginning to end.

1. It is not true, that "during these ages, the practice of private confession to a priest was not held generally to be a matter of necessity." It would be very easy to accumulate proof to establish the fact, that, from the very beginning of the Church, the obligation of confession to a priest was generally recognized among Christians. The most ancient fathers, both Greek and Latin, bear unequivocal testimony, not only to the fact that confession was generally practiced in the ages in which they

1 P. 81.

2 This part of the Prayer Book has been *expunged* from the American editions. It was too *popish* to suit this latitude!

Hosted by Google

severally wrote, but also as to the other more important one, that its obligation was generally believed and felt. These two facts are indeed intimately connected with each other; for it would have been utterly impossible to induce men generally to adopt so painful an observance, unless they had been previously convinced of its obligation and necessity.

Out of a host of evidence bearing on the subject, our space will allow us to refer only to the testimony of Tertullian and of St. Cyprian, who wrote in the second and third centuries. Both of these fathers agree with all the others who have written on the subject, in enforcing the obligation of *exomologesis*, or confession to a priest. Tertullian says of confession:

"Wherefore confession, (*exomologesis*[1]) is a discipline for the abasement and humiliation of man, enjoining such conversation as invites mercy: it directs, also, even in the manner of dress and food — to lie in sackcloth and ashes, to hide the body in mean garments, to cast down the spirit with mourning, to exchange for severe treatment the sins which he has committed; *to fall down before the priests and to kneel before the beloved of God.*[2] All these things does *exomologesis* (confession) perform, that it may commend repentance; that by fearing danger it may honor God; that by itself pronouncing judgment on the sinner, it may act in the stead of God's wrath; and that, by means of temporal affliction, it may, I will not say frustrate, but clear off the eternal penalties."

Speaking of those who defer confession through shame, he says:

They "are more mindful of their shame than of their salvation, like those who, having contracted some shameful malady, avoid making their physicians acquainted with it, and so perish with their bashfulness. It is, forsooth, intolerable to modesty, to make satisfaction to their offended Lord! To be restored to the health which they have wasted away! Brave art thou, in thy modesty, truly, bearing an open front in sinning, and a bashful one in praying for pardon! . . . Verily, the concealment of a sin, promises a great benefit to our modesty! Namely, that if we withdraw any thing from the knowledge of men, we shall also, of course, conceal it from God! And is it thus, then, that the thoughts of men and the knowledge of God are compared? *Is it better to be damned in secret, than to be absolved openly?*"[3]

To extinguish this false shame and encourage the sinner to make his confession, he alleges the following strong motive; — which clearly proves the belief universally prevalent in the second century, that confession of grievous sin was necessary, and of Divine obligation:

"If thou drawest back from confession (*exomologesis*), consider in thy heart *that* hell-fire which confession shall quench for thee;[4] and first imagine to thyself the greatness of this punishment, that thou mayest not doubt concerning the adoption of the remedy. . . When, therefore, thou knowest that against hell-fire, after that first protection of the baptism ordained by the Lord, there is yet in confession (*exomologesis*) a second

1 The Greek word for confession, often used by the early fathers.

2 Presbyteris advolvi, et caris Dei adgeniculari. For *caris — beloved*, some editions read *aris — altars*.

3 An melius est damnatum latere quam palam absolvi?

4 Quam tibi exomologesis extinguet.

Hosted by Google

aid, why dost thou abandon thy salvation? Why delay to enter on that, which thou knowest will heal thee?"[1]

St. Cyprian writes not less clearly of the faith and practice of Christians on this subject, in the third century:

"None can escape the eye of God. He sees the heart and breast of every person; and He will judge, not only our actions, but also our words and thoughts. He regards the minds of all, and the wishes concealed even in the hidden recesses of the breast. In fine, how much loftier in faith, and superior in the fear (of God) are those who, though implicated in no crime of sacrifice, or of accepting a certificate, yet, *because they have only had the thought thereof, this very thing sorrowingly and honestly confessing before the priests of God, make a confession (exomologesis) of their conscience,* expose the burden of the soul, seek out a *salutary cure even* for light and little wounds, knowing that it is written, "God will not be mocked. . . . I beseech you, most dear brethren, let each confess his sin, whilst he that has sinned is yet among the living; while his confession can be admitted; while the satisfaction and the remission, made through the priests, are pleasing before the Lord."[2]

Many similar passages from the writings of these two and of other fathers might be alleged; but these will suffice to show that, even from the very earliest period, the obligation of confession to a priest was generally recognized. And it is not to be supposed, that this obligation was less sensibly or extensively felt during ages which, Mr. Palmer himself assures us, constantly "appealed to the sentiments of the ancient fathers and councils in the interpretation of the Bible."[3]

2. Nor is it at all true that "this custom was abolished in the east by Nectarius, patriarch of Constantinople, in the fourth century, and by the majority of the eastern church."[4] This is a most glaring perversion of history. Nectarius never even dreamed of abolishing *private* confession to a priest; nor did the majority of the eastern church ever think of any such thing. Such confession continued to be general throughout the Greek church after the death of Nectarius, as we learn from his successor, St. Chrysostom, (A. D. 397), and from all the historians of that period. This is altogether certain from incontestable evidence, which we could easily accumulate; and Mr. Palmer should be ashamed to assert the contrary.[5] Both the historians, Sozomenus and Socrates,[6] who relate the fact of Nectarius, plainly bear us out in our assertion.

The former introduces his account of the affair in the following words: "As to avoid all sin is more than human nature can do; and God has commanded pardon to be granted to those that repent, though they have often sinned; and as, in begging pardon, *it is necessary that sin should be at the same time confessed, it, from the beginning,* deservedly seemed to the priests a heavy burden, that sinners should proclaim their sins, as in a

1 De Pœnitentia. n. 8 — 12.

2 Confiteantur singuli delictum suum, dum adhuc qui deliquit in sæculo est dum admitti confessio ejus potest, dum satisfactio et remissio facta per sacerdotes apud Dominum grata est. — *De Lapsis*

3 P. 78, *sup. citat.*

4 Mr. Palmer had asserted the same thing more in detail on pages 32, 33.

5 See "Faith of Catholics," vol. III, p. 28, *et. seq.*, and Catholic theologians, *passim.*

6 They wrote in the fifth century, and continued the Church History of Eusebius.

Hosted by Google

theatre, in the presence of all the multitude."[1] He then goes on to state how, some time in the third century, a public penitentiary was appointed to receive the confession, and to enjoin suitable public penance; and how, from a great scandal which occurred in the church of Constantinople, Nectarius was induced, by the popular clamor and indignation, to suppress this office of penitentiary. This functionary presided over the distribution of *public* penances, and was a kind of *censor morum* His office once suppressed, things returned to their usual course, and Christians still believed, as the historian who wrote after the event, assures us, that "it was *necessary* that sin should be confessed." By the act of Nectarius, the office of *public* penitentiary alone was abolished, and with it the discipline of *public* confession, "as in a theatre," was done away with; but the obligation of private confession was still generally felt and acted on. You might as well argue from the breaking of an unworthy magistrate or judge, that the whole administration of justice was abolished, as to argue the general suppression of confession from this fact of Nectarius.

Socrates relates the whole occurrence in almost the same manner; and he unites with Sozomenus in expressing his decided disapproval of the conduct of Nectarius[2]. What both historians add, that after this suppression of the penitentiary, Christians in the east "were permitted to confess their sins to a priest, before communion, as their own judgment might direct them," besides that it had, as they both explicitly avow, no relation whatever to the western churches, could only be meant to imply that *public* confession to the penitentiary was no longer enjoined in the east.[3]

Mr. Palmer is heartily welcome to all the benefit, he or his admirers may be able to derive from these stubborn facts. His version of the matter is the same old stale and hackneyed charge, which had been already repeated and refuted a hundred times; and which, in spite of all evidence to the contrary, will perhaps still be repeated to the end of time by prejudiced smatterers, who may write what they will call *history*.

It is really curious to see how our author applies his strange Oxford theory in regard to the holy Eucharist, to the facts of Church History, during the period in question. If any one can clearly understand his real opinion on the subject, he must have clearer optics than ourselves, even with the aid of our Roman glasses; and Bishop Whittingham, as we shall see, only makes confusion worse confounded. Neither of them seems either to admit or to deny the real presence; they both halt *somewhere* between these two things; but whether they hold to the absurd system of Lutheran consubstantiation, or to the wholly unintelligible opinion of Calvin of a *real figurative* presence; or whether they have

1 Hist. Ecclesiast. lib. vii. cap. xvi.

2 Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ, lib. v. cap. xix. For all the facts and evidence on the subject see Palma *Prælectiones*, vol. i, part ii, p. 141, *et. seq.*

3 See the notes of the learned Henry Valois on the ecclesiastical histories of Socrates and Sezomenus.

Hosted by Google

struck out a new path or new paths for themselves, we are really not prepared to say. As our readers may, however, be more acute than we are, we will give them an opportunity of judging for themselves; merely recording our decided conviction, that there is, and can be, no rational medium between the full admission of the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, and the unqualified rejection of the real presence altogether.

Mr. Palmer thus writes on the subject:

"In the ninth century, the doctrine of the holy Eucharist became the subject of discussion. It had never been denied by the Catholic Church, that this sacrament, when consecrated, continues to be bread and wine, according to the words of the apostle: 'the *bread* which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?' and of our Lord, 'I will drink no more of the *fruit of the vine*,'" *etc.*[1]

We humbly enter our solemn protest against the putting of this absurd interpretation, or rather perversion of the Scriptures, into the mouth of the Holy Catholic Church. The passage from St. Paul, and what the apostle farther says on the subject in the following chapter, clearly establish the Catholic doctrine of the real presence; and his calling the holy Eucharist *bread* after the consecration, only proves that it continued to have all the appearances and sensible qualities of bread; while the words of our blessed Lord, as clearly appears from St. Luke's gospel, do not refer to the consecrated wine at all, but merely to that used in the paschal supper, which preceded the institution of the holy Eucharist. All this has been proved over and again; nor does our present scope require or allow us to enter fully into a subject, which has been already fully elucidated.

The historian next proceeds to state, that Paschasius Radbert, a French monk, first introduced the doctrine of transubstantiation (!), and to censure Scotus and Berengarius for falling into the opposite extreme, of "declaring the Eucharist to be a *bare* sign of the body and blood of Christ, contrary to the universal belief of the Church."[2] Here the Right Reverend note-maker feels aggrieved, and undertakes to defend Berengarius after this wise:

"This was long held to be the case; yet not without doubt. (See *Mosheim.*) But it has lately been disproved by the publication of a treatise of Berenger, fuller and later than any before known, which plainly shows his view of the sacrament to have been different from that of Scotus."

The bishop here again proves himself much wiser than all antiquity, —wiser than the bishops of the eight different councils which successively condemned the errors of Berengarius from the year 1050 to the year 1080,—wiser than Berengarius himself, who repeatedly quotes and praises the opinions of Scotus. We are left to our conjectures as to the character of this "publication of Berenger, fuller and later than any

1 Page 80. 2 Ibid, page 81.

Hosted by Google

before known;" but we presume that it is not "fuller or later" than the unequivocal recantation of his errors, and profession of the Catholic faith made by him in the council of Bordeaux, in 1080; which confession of faith was satisfactory to the assembled fathers, and obtained his readmission into the bosom of the Catholic Church, from which he is not recorded to have again departed. This is surely the fullest and latest edition of the opinions of Berengarius.

But the bishop evidently wished to catch, in the meshes of Puseyism, the cunning arch-heretic of the eleventh century. If the facts of history would warrant it, we would cheerfully give him, not only Berengarius, but all the heretics of the olden time. In fact, the crafty and versatile archdeacon of Angers (Berengarius) would, we humbly think, have made an excellent Puseyite, had he only chanced to be born at Oxford in the nineteenth century! He had all the qualities requisite for a genuine Oxfordite. He had the knack of so wrapping up his real opinions in obscure verbiage, as to mystify and deceive his cotemporaries, including even many bishops. But Pope Gregory VII. was as cunning at least as he: he caught him at last, won him by kindness, convinced him of his errors, and caused him to recant, first in the Roman council held in 1073, and then, more fully and explicitly, in that of Bordeaux, in 1080. If the Puseyites, who have imitated him in his wanderings, would likewise imitate him in his return to Catholic unity, they would find Pius IX. as kind and paternal as was Gregory VII. But whether the Protestant bishop of Maryland be disposed to follow this "latest" example of Berengarius or not, we at least wish him more success in his effort to make Berengarius a Puseyite, than he has had in a late similar attempt on one Ratramn.[1]

On another page, the bishop gives, in a note, a very curious explanation of the manner in which, what he calls the "unholy tyranny" of Rome originated. As a specimen of sagacious reasoning, it is, in truth, a perfect curiosity in its way. Mr. Palmer had said that during this period "the bishops began to assume temporal authority—"[2] he would have said, more truly, that emperors and princes and circumstances *forced* it upon them. Now here is the editor's sapient note on the subject:

"It was clearly through these usurpations of the bishops that the unholy tyranny of Rome grew into being. The episcopal claims were gradually concentred in the one apostolical see of the west; and all the power that the weakness or wickedness of temporal princes had thrown into the hands of the spiritual rulers, was thus drawn to a single focus."

Well, we humbly think, and we say it with all due respect, that the bishop's wits were not "drawn to a focus," when he penned this strange note. To us it sounds like something very nearly akin to

1 For a learned and satisfactory account of Berengarius, see Palma, *Prælectiones*, vol. iii, part i, page 33, *et seq.*

2 Page 103.

Hosted by Google

downright absurdity. The bishops throughout the world acquired more power, and therefore more independence; and hence the Roman Pontiffs were enabled the more easily to establish their "unholy tyranny" over them! We would as soon undertake to extract logic and sense from the vagaries of Puseyism itself, as to gather either from this precious piece of argument!

Mr. Palmer attempts to account for the origin of this "unholy tyranny" in another way: he brings up again, for the hundredth time, the stale argument drawn from the spurious decretals, ascribed to Isidore Mercator. This argument had been dead and buried centuries ago; but our Oxfordite calls it up again from the tomb, hoping by the exhibition of the ghastly spectre to frighten — old women and children! for men of sense have long since learned to view it with a steady nerve; that is, if they can check the rising disposition to merriment, at the absurd importance attached to it by some superficial persons! Here are his words:

"The power of the Roman see in the western church was greatly augmented in the ninth century, by the fabrication of a large body of decretal epistles or ecclesiastical laws, which purported to have been written by the Popes during the first three centuries, and in which the judgment of all bishops, the holding of all councils, and a right to hear appeals from all ecclesiastical judgments, were claimed for the Roman Pontiffs," etc.[1]

Mosheim had gone a step farther, and boldly asserted, what our modest historian only plainly intimates, that the Popes themselves were concerned in this fabrication. The truth is, the Popes had nothing at all to do with the collection in question; nor can it be proved that Nicholas I. ever declared those decretals genuine, as Mr. Palmer asserts he did.[2] They were composed and circulated, some time in the eighth century, by some person calling himself *Isidore Mercator* or *Peccator*,[3] — a man so obscure that the learned are not yet agreed as to his origin, or even his name. He appears to have composed the work somewhere in Germany

1 Pages 103—4.

2 Ibid. The spurious decretals were circulated in conjunction with many other documents of undoubted genuineness; and the whole collection was soon received as having the force of law. Nicholas I. merely insisted on its authority as law, which it had already acquired by custom. The fact of its genuineness was not so much discussed as assumed. (Cf. *Epist. Nicholai I. Hincmaro Rhemens.*) Some additional light is perhaps thrown on this whole transaction by the fact, that it was not unusual in the fourth, fifth, and following centuries, for authors to write under assumed or fictitious names. Thus the writer who put forth the collection of canonical regulations, called the *Apostolical Constitutions*, probably some time in the fourth century, ascribed those laws to the apostles themselves: though they merely embodied the ecclesiastical discipline of the first four centuries; chiefly that of the Greek church. This collection is certainly spurious; yet it has considerable authority from the fact just named, and from the additional circumstance, that it had great weight in the fourth and following centuries. Isidore's collection borrowed largely from the one just named. In the fifth century, Vigilius Tapsensis composed several works under the fictitious name of *Athanasius;* and some critics believe that he is the real author of the works ascribed to Dionysius, the Areopagite. In those times, men did not care so much for the name of the author, as for the intrinsic merits of his book: and this circumstance may aid us in understanding, why the collection of Isidore was not more critically examined.

3 Some think that the real author of them was *Benedictus Levita.*

Hosted by Google

He states himself that his object in writing it was,—not to exalt the privileges of the Roman Pontiffs,—but to save the bishops from being annoyed with unnecessary litigation.

Will it be believed that a man so obscure, and writing in a part of the world so remote from Rome, would have been able to revolutionize public opinion in regard to the power of the Popes? Would a mere pettifogger of the present day be able, by putting out a new body of laws, to change the whole face of the science of jurisprudence, and to make men believe what they had hitherto rejected? It will be said, that this is an enlightened, and that the eighth century was a dark age. But even admitting all this, for the sake of argument, the parallel still holds good; for it requires not enlightenment, but mere common sense,—and men we presume always had common sense,—not to be led away by every driveler who may choose to broach a new system, or to publish a new book.

Had the spurious collection of Isidore contained aught that was not fully conformable to the canonical usages of the eighth and ninth centuries, it would certainly never have obtained the approbation it did receive. It passed current unchallenged, because it did but embody the principles of those and of previous ages. Nor was it entirely a fabrication; it was chiefly a tissue of passages extracted from the councils and fathers of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries. The only fault of the writer was, to have placed these words in the mouths of the Popes of the first three centuries. This, though a serious fault in criticism, was yet not one which seriously affected the substance of things. Something more than mere assertion will be necessary to prove that the principles embodied in this collection were new and before unheard of; or that the action on them by the Roman Pontiffs was generally resisted by "the bishops, especially those of France,"—as Mr. Palmer tells us.[1]

It could be easily proved, that all the prerogatives of the Roman Pontiffs,—"the judgment of all bishops, the holding of all councils, and a right to hear appeals from all ecclesiastical judgment,"—which our flippant historian assures us were first introduced by these false decretals, had been already generally recognized and brought into action for many centuries before.

Had not the third and fourth canons of the great council of Sardica, in the middle of the fourth century, expressly recognized the right of the Roman Pontiffs to receive appeals from all parts of Christendom, especially in controversies regarding bishops? Had not the Bishops of Rome exercised this right of their see from the very beginning, not only in the west but also in the east? Had not Pope Julius I. written to the Arians of the east, who had condemned St. Athanasius, as follows: "Were you ignorant that *it was customary* that we should be written to first, that *hence the first decision might issue?*" And does not the

1 Ibid.

Hosted by Google

Greek historian, Sozomenus, speaking of this letter of Julius, say: "There was a sacerdotal law, that those things should be held *null* and *void*, which were done *against* or *without the sanction of the Roman Bishop?*"[1] Had not the legate of the Roman see, in the general council of Chalcedon, (A. D. 451,) composed almost entirely of Greek bishops, insisted successfully on the exclusion from the council, of Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria, on the ground that he "had presumed and dared to celebrate a general synod without the authority of the holy see, *which never had been allowed, never had been done?*"[2]

A volume might be filled with such facts; but these will suffice to prove, that the spurious decretals effected no change whatever in the relations of the Church to the Roman Pontiffs.[3]

We must briefly advert to one more topic, and then we will close our remarks on the present epoch. Mr. Palmer tells our roundly, that the Greek schism was caused by the ambition of the Roman Pontiffs: "the east and the west were estranged by the ambition of the Roman Pontiffs."[4] Nothing could be more unfounded than this assertion. All the documents of history conspire to prove, that it was the unhallowed ambition of the bishops of Constantinople, and not that of the Roman Pontiffs, which originated and consummated this deplorable division of the Church. The see of Constantinople — called Byzantium before it became the seat of empire under Constantine the Great in 330 — was not even one of those which had been founded by the apostles or their immediate disciples. Originally it had no pre-eminence whatever; its bishops were merely the suffragans of Heraclea, the metropolis of Thrace. For the first three hundred and fifty years of the Christian era, it was never even mentioned among the principal sees. During all this time, there were only three great patriarchates, which ranked as follows: first, that of Rome; second that of Alexandria; third, that of Antioch.[5] This order of pre-eminence was generally recognized, and was followed in the proceedings of the first general council, — that of Nice, in 325.

It is curious to mark the various successive steps, by which this original order of things was disturbed, and the bishops of Constantinople arose to eminence by their own restless ambition, aided by the influence of the Greek emperors. This powerful influence repressed, if it did not silence, the murmurs of the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, who could not but view with some displeasure this sudden elevation of the bishops of the imperial city, to the prejudice of their own long established rights. The first step was taken in the second general council convened at Constantinople, in the year 381, for the condemnation of the heresy of Macedonius, bishop of that city,— and we may remark here, *en passant*,

1 Hist. Ecclesiast. lib. iii, cap. x.

2 "Quia præsumpsit, et ausus est synodum generalem facere sine auctoritate sedis Apostolicæ, quod *nunquam licuit*, *nunquam. factum est.*" — *Concil. Chalced. Act.* i. Cf. Archbishop Kenrick "on the Primacy."

3 This whole subject is handled by Palma with his usual learning and ability. — *Prælectiones* tom. ii, part II, p. 124, *et seq.* See also Archbishop Kenrick "on the Primacy."

4 P. 5.

5 That of Jerusalem was of subsequent date.

Hosted by Google

that the bishops of Constantinople originated three at least, if not more, of the great heresies which disturbed the early Church!

The third canon of this council enacted, that "the bishop of Constantinople should have the first place of honor *after* the Roman bishop, because Constantinople is the new Rome." This is, to say the least, a very insufficient reason for a plain usurpation: but it marks the *real* source of the pre-eminence claimed by the Constantinopolitan bishops. The Roman see, and the Western Church, never approved of this canon. It was justly viewed as the commencement of an innovation fraught with danger to the Church. The forecast of the Roman Pontiffs has been, alas! but too sadly confirmed by the event.

Emboldened by this partial success, the ambitious bishops of Constantinople went a step farther. After the council of Chalcedon had closed its sessions in 451, and the legates of the Roman see had departed, Anatolius, then bishop of Constantinople, assembled a portion of the eastern bishops, and clandestinely enacted the famous 28th canon of that council which gave to the bishops of the imperial city, for the reason assigned above, *equal* honor and authority with those of Rome: and this too in the face of the solemn declarations of the same council in its sixteenth *action* or session: "We all see that, before all things, the primacy and the principal honor should, according to the canons, be confirmed to the most beloved Arch-bishop of ancient Rome!" It is needless to observe, that Pope St. Leo the Great, and with him all the western Church, strongly condemned this canon.

We pass over the arrogant assumption by John the Faster, — another bishop of Constantinople, — of the lofty title of *œcumenical* or *universal* bishop, — an attempt for which he was well rebuked by Pope St. Gregory the Great. We omit also to refer to some further indications of a similar pride in the proceedings of the Greek council in Trullo, in 692; or to the ambitious attempts of the bishops of Constantinople to encroach on the jurisdiction of the Roman patriarchate.[1] We come down immediately to Photius in the ninth century, who was certainly an ambitious usurper, foisted into the see of Constantinople by the power of the imperial court. His consecration was in every respect uncanonical and irregular; Rome very properly raised her voice against it, and succeeded in having the sainted Ignatius, the lawful bishop, re-established in his see. The schism was thus crushed for a time; but Photius was a man of great talent and versatility, and as untiring in his efforts as he was unprincipled. He succeeded, but too well, in poisoning the minds of many among the Greek bishops against Rome; and he was enabled to exercise this baneful influence the more effectually, after he had succeeded, by his arts, in being again constituted bishop of Constantinople, on the death of St. Ignatius.

Two centuries later, this suppressed animosity broke out into an open, and, with two brief intervals excepted, a final rupture with Rome, under

[1] This is acknowledged in substance by Mr. Palmer himself — pp 104, 105.

Hosted by Google

the Constantinopolitan bishop, Michael Cerularius. Mr. Palmer himself admits, that this proud man was the aggressor, in the controversy which arose between him and Rome. He tells us that

"When Cerularius, bishop of Constantinople, wrote to the bishop of Trani in Italy condemning several of the rites and ceremonies of the Roman Church, and shut up the Latin churches and monasteries in Constantinople, the legate of the Roman see, Cardinal Humbert, insisted on his implicit submission to the Pope; and, on his refusal, left an excommunication on the altar of his patriarchal church of St. Sophia at Constantinople."[1]

Among the "rites and ceremonies of the Roman Church" censured by Cerularius in his letter to John, bishop of Trani, were the following:

"That the Latins did not abstain from things strangled and from blood; that they consecrated in unleavened bread; that *their monks eat hogs' lard;* that their *priests shaved their beards;* that their bishops wore rings like bridegrooms; that fast was kept on Saturday; and that *Alleluia* was not sung in Lent!"[2]

With this brief summary of undoubted facts, we leave our readers to decide, whether it was the ambition of the Roman Pontiffs which caused the Greek schism. We could easily show that in *all* the first eight general councils, composed too almost entirely of Greek bishops, the primacy of the Roman Pontiffs was distinctly and repeatedly recognized; and that in *all* of them the legates of the Roman see presided.[3] We must be content with one or two remarks on the proceedings of the first general council,—that of Nice, in 325.

The sixth canon of this council has often been cited against the primacy; though, even as it now stands, it says nothing opposed to this tenet. In many of the oldest manuscript copies of the Nicene canons, the phrase, "THE ROMAN CHURCH ALWAYS HELD THE PRIMACY,"[4] is inserted at the beginning of this same canon. It was found in the copy used by the Roman Church in the fourth century; and it was read and approved of in the sixteenth session of the council of Chalcedon. The passage which we quoted above from this council, immediately follows the reading of the Nicene canon with the clause referred to. That this clause was also found in the older collections of the Nicene canons, used in the east in the fourth century, would appear from a decree of the Emperor Valentinian against St. Hilary of Arles, in which instrument distinct allusion is made to this portion of the canon: "the *authority of the sacred synod* has confirmed the primacy of the apostolic see of Peter," &c.[5]

But our observations on the present epoch have already extended far beyond what we had originally intended, and though many things yet remain to be noticed, we must hasten on to the next æra.

1 P 106. 2 See Palma, vol. iii, part i, p. 62 *et seq.*

3 See, among other writers, Cabassutius—*Notitia Ecclesias.* p. 103, *et seq.* and Archbishop Kenrick "on the Primacy."

4 Η εκκλησια Ρωμης παντοτε ειχε τα πρωτεια.

5 Cf Cabassutius, ibid, p. 111, *et seq.* vol. i, fol. Edit. Lugduni, 1702.

Hosted by Google

EPOCH IV, A. D. 1054—1517.[1]

Our remarks on this period will be necessarily very brief. It was signalized by the final conversion of many of the northern nations, and by the holy lives of such men as St. Anselm, St. Bernard, St. Laurence Justinian, and Thomas à Kempis. Our author furnishes beautiful sketches of the lives of all these illustrious men. We have room only for the following touching anecdote of St. Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, who died, A. D. 1109:

"He often retired in the day to his devotions, and not unfrequently continued the whole night in prayer. An anecdote has been preserved which shows how continually his mind was engaged on the great and awful realities of religion. One day as he was riding, at one of his manors, a hare pursued by the hounds ran under his horse for refuge; on which he stopped, and the hounds stood at bay. The hunters began to laugh at the circumstance; but Anselm said weeping 'this hare reminds me of a poor sinner on the point of departing this life surrounded by devils waiting to carry away their prey.' The hare going off, he forbade her to be pursued, and was obeyed. In this manner every circumstance served to raise his mind to God; and, in the midst of noise and tumult, he enjoyed all of that tranquility and peace which naturally arose from the continual contemplation of his God and Saviour, and which elevated him above the cares and anxieties of this life."[2]

This is a pretty good specimen of the good old Catholic piety in the middle ages. We doubt very much whether any Protestant archbishop of Canterbury has been endowed with any such sanctity; or whether any one of the modern fox-hunting parsons of the Anglican establishment was ever known to pause in the chase, to make any such pious reflections! What says Bishop Whittingham on this subject? He has not thought it necessary to append a little note here, for our special enlightenment.

We have much fault to find with many of our author's statements during this period; but, strange to say, we have little cause to blame his Right Reverend editor. This probably arises from the fact that his lordship, exhausted perhaps by his previous labors in the field of history, rests his wearied mind during these 364 years somewhat after the manner of the seven sleepers of old. The four small notes which he has dropped might have been penned *inter somnum et vigilias*, for all the importance they possess, or the information they convey! One of them seems to have been written, when he was just beginning to awake from a horrid dream of papal tyranny and "Romish" abominations. We must record this incoherent "note of a dreamer," and then we will leave his lordship to enjoy his slumbers undisturbed.

Mr. Palmer had, in the text, praised the refusal of the Greek church to submit to the primacy of Rome.[3] The episcopal note-maker here breaks forth in the following pious strain:

"It ought not to be overlooked, how the providence of God thus made the Roman attempts at usurpation (!) provide an insuperable bar

1 From p. 106 – 146. 2 Pages 120, 121 3 Page 130

Hosted by Google

to the subsequent claim of Catholicity to Romish (!) corruptions in doctrine and practice. The latter *might* have become universal but for the hostility awakened by the former."[1]

We will pass over the rhetoric of this passage. Now for the logic. If the "Romish" Church was not then Catholic, pray what church was? Was the Greek church, — confined as it certainly was to a comparatively small portion of the earth, — endowed with this attribute of universality? Though even this would not be so palpably absurd, as the pretension of the Anglican church to be the Church Catholic! As well might Bishop Whittingham pretend that Maryland is the whole world! Or had the Catholic Church, which the bishop professes to believe in, as often as he recites either of the two creeds still held by his church, vanished entirely from the face of the earth? What then became of the solemn promises of Christ? Besides it is truly unfortunate for the worthy editor's argument, that the Greek church then held, and still holds those identical "corruptions in doctrine and practice" which so much excite his bile against the "Romish" Church; and, as far at least as these are concerned, she agreed and yet agrees with the Roman Church. Perhaps the obstinate repugnance of the Greeks to the shaving of the beard, and to the use of hogs' lard by the monks, destroyed the Catholicity of the Church! We had quite forgotten this! We give it up!

We will now glance rapidly at some of the leading inaccuracies of our historian in matters of fact. Speaking of the primacy, he uses this sweeping language:—

"As for the eastern churches they rejected and denied this novel(!) doctrine which was never declared to be an article of faith by any general synod; for the synod of Lyons, in which this doctrine was advanced by the ambassadors of the Greek emperor to gratify the Pope, and by some Greek bishops who acted under intimidation; and the synod of Florence, in which it was forced on those Greek bishops who were present, were rejected by the Greek church. The latter synod, indeed, was of doubtful authority even in the west, as it consisted only of Italian bishops, while the rival synod of Basle was sitting at the same time."[2]

There are at least six palpable misstatements in this extract, besides other smaller ones expressed or implied.

1. It is not true, that this was a *novel* doctrine, as we have already shown. 2. It is not true, that this article was not defined by any general synod: it had been expressly declared to be the faith of the Church, and had been acted on as such, in every one of the six first general councils, which our author himself admits to have been œcumenical. This we have also seen. 3. It is not true that the Greek church, at least at first, rejected the general synod — the second of Lyons — held in 1274. They subsequently refused to admit its authority, but they had already approved of it, through their regular representatives at the council. 4. The same must be said of the council of Florence, which was only subsequently

1 Note, *ibid.* 2 Page 116.

Hosted by Google

rejected by the Greeks, chiefly through the perfidious conduct of Mark, bishop of Ephesus. This instability of the Greeks only proved the proverbial Greek faith — the *Græca fides ;* but it did not invalidate the acts of the councils in question, any more than the rejection of the first general council of Nice by the Arians had rendered null its doctrinal decisions.

5. There is no evidence to prove that, in the general council of Lyons, "the ambassadors of the Greek emperor" advocated the primacy to "gratify the Pope," or that in it "the Greek bishops acted under intimidation." This is all a paltry suspicion unworthy of an historian. This same council of Lyons was one of the most numerous that was ever convened: it was composed of five hundred bishops, both Latin and Greek, besides one thousand abbots and distinguished divines: and it certainly clearly represented the whole Church.

6. It is not true, that the council of Florence "was of doubtful authority, even in the west." The "rival synod of Basle" had degenerated into a schismatical conventicle, which had very few adherents; and the whole western Church very soon after received the decrees of the Florentine council. Its canons were universally viewed as having emanated from a general council; at least those which had been enacted before the departure of the Greek bishops; — including the famous definition on the primacy, which was signed by the bishops of both the Greek and Latin churches. It is not true, that this synod "consisted only of Italian bishops;" the Greek church was certainly represented in it by some of its bishops; and after the departure of these, the Armenian and Jacobite, and subsequently the Abyssinian bishops sanctioned its decrees, and were re-united to the Roman Church.[1] Were not the six general councils which Mr. Palmer receives, composed almost entirely of Greek bishops? Was the Latin Church as fully represented in any of them, as was the Greek Church in those of Lyons and Florence?

We should be endless were we to undertake the refutation of all the historical blunders, which our author has scattered over the pages that treat of this epoch. Here, for instance, is another curious extract from the same page as the one just given:

"The synod of Florence, just alluded to, was the first which taught the doctrine of purgatory as an article of faith. It (*not the synod, but the doctrine*) had indeed been held by the Popes and by many writers; and it became the popular doctrine during the period under review; but it was not decreed by any authority of the universal, or even the whole Latin Church. In the eastern church it was always rejected."

Even admitting, for the sake of argument, that the council of Florence was the first which defined this doctrine as an article of faith, would it thence follow that the doctrine itself was of recent origin? It could only be inferred that it was never before questioned; and that, therefore, there was no need of any definition on the subject. Would it follow from the fact, that the council of Nice was the first general synod which

1. Cabassutius, *Notitia Ecclesiastica*, in Concilia Lugdun. II, et Florentinum.

Hosted by Google

defined the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, that this too was a new doctrine, unknown to the three previous centuries? Mr. Palmer himself admits, that this tenet of purgatory "had become the popular doctrine during the period under review;" which, in connection with the solemn promises of Christ to guard his Church from error, clearly proves that it was an article of divine revelation, — on the principles even of our Oxford divine!

It is not true, that "it was always rejected in the eastern church." The Greek church admitted it in the council of Florence, and, at least, impliedly, in that of Lyons. It had never been a bar to union between the churches, however their theologians may have differed on the secondary question, — whether the souls detained in this middle place of temporary expiation, are purified by a material fire? The ancient fathers, both of the Greek and Latin Church, who had occasion to refer to the subject, had unanimously agreed in maintaining the doctrine, as could be easily shown by reference to their works.[1] All the ancient liturgies of both churches had embodied this same article of faith. And even at present, not only the Greek church, but all the oriental sectaries still hold it as doctrine, and practice accordingly.

We are prepared to prove all this, and more besides. Let Bishop Whittingham only deny *one* of these facts, and we promise him proof to his heart's content.

We are also amply provided with proof to establish the falsity of the following statement, which we merely give as a specimen of Oxford skill in mystification:

"The council of Lateran (the fourth of that name, A. D. 1215,) indeed, had made use of the word *transubstantiation* to express the change by which the bread and wine become the sacrament of Christ's body and blood; but this word might be, and in fact was, used in many senses inconsistent with the Romish interpretation of it; and the object of the synod itself seems to have been merely to establish the old doctrine of the presence and reception of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament, in opposition to the Manichean errors."

This is, indeed, a curious piece of absurdity. It is worthy of Dr. Pusey himself. So Rome, we presume, must go to Oxford, before she can learn her own doctrines aright! This same doctrine of transubstantiation, besides being perhaps the clearest of all the doctrines contained in the Bible, could be also established by whole volumes of ancient testimony.[2]

Our historian tells us the truth, — who would have thought it? — about the doctrine of indulgences; but he complains, singularly enough, that their too great extension ruined the ancient penitential discipline of the Church:

1. See their testimonies accumulated in the "Faith of Catholics," *sup. cit.* See also the learned work of the Greek, Leo Allatius — "De Consensu Orientalis Ecclesiæ, &c., in dogmate Purgatorii." 1 Vol. 12mo. This work exhausts the subject. Wonder if Mr. Palmer ever heard of this learned publication!

2 See "Faith of the Catholics." — *sup. cit.*

Hosted by Google

"The plenary indulgence which the Popes issued, first to the crusaders, but afterwards to many other persons, completed the ruin of the penitential discipline of the Church. These indulgences, or pardons, were the remission of the lengthened works of penitence imposed by the ancient canons. All that was necessary to obtain them, was to confess to a priest all past sins (with true sorrow and purpose of amendment, we add,) to go to the crusade in Palestine or in some other country, or to perform some other work assigned by the Pope."[1]

One would think that this *all* was a great deal. Protestants have granted a much more ample indulgence than this: — they have abolished penitential works altogether, and with them every thing that is in any way painful to human nature! Theirs is at least a very easy way to heaven, provided it be only safe. They — the Anglican "Church Catholic" (!) always included — have swept off entirely, at one fell stroke, the whole ancient "penitential system of the Church." Why does not Mr. Palmer, and why does not the Protestant bishop of Maryland, make *some* effort to restore this same ancient penitential system?

Our author says, that the scapular "was now worn by some persons as a sort of charm;"[2]—we thought it was worn only as a *badge* of a pious confraternity. He ridicules the idea of the commutation of one penance for another, and laughs at St. Peter Damian for affirming,— for which fact we have only his bare word, — "that the repetition of the psalter twenty times accompanied by discipline (that is, scourging,) was equal to a hundred years of penitence."[3] This he calls an ingenious way of "paying the debt."[4] Protestants have discovered a far more ingenious way of paying this same debt of penance, — they have *repudiated* it altogether!

He cannot bear the idea of "sackcloth or haircloth worn next the skin, by way of voluntary mortification."[5] It is absolutely shocking to his delicate nerves, only to think of this cruel infliction! Nor can he relish the devotion of the rosary, introduced by St. Dominic. The Protestant sense of smell has become, alas! too obtuse to perceive the delightful fragrance of this sweet chaplet of *roses*, woven in honor of her, —"the pure and holy one,"— who is

"Our tainted nature's solitary boast."[6]

Though, in truth, the honor is given chiefly to her divine Son, from whom all her beauty is borrowed, and on whom it is again reflected back. "The sensual man perceiveth not the things which are of the Spirit of God: for it is foolishness to him, and he cannot understand; because it is spiritually examined."[7]

Our author complains of the power of the Popes during this period; he denominates it "the grand and crying evil of these ages."[8] He tells us two or three "rousing" ones, about the sainted Gregory VII;[9] which he would have himself detected as such, had he only opened the life of

1 P. 138. 2 P. 142. 3 P. 141. 4 Ibid. 5 P. 142.
6 Wordsworth. 7 1 Cor. ii, 14. 8 P. 132 9 P. 133

Hosted by Google

this great Pontiff, lately written by the Protestant historian, Voigt. He gives us an absolutely incredible account of some disputes between the Pope and the bishops of England:[1] but he takes special care not to give us the name of the Pope in question, though we *guess* he means the great Innocent IV.; nor does he furnish any authority whatever for his statement. We enter a simple denial of the entire account, and challenge proof. The author, in fact, seems to become absolutely unsettled in mind, whenever the Popes and his own dear England come into collision; or even when, without coming into actual conflict, they appear at all on the arena.

He should have borne in mind, that, but for the efforts of the Popes, and for the power they acquired in temporal matters by the free consent of the European nations, Europe would, in all human probability, never have arisen from barbarism nor progressed in civilization. That power was almost always put in requisition to check tyranny, and to succor the oppressed. The voice of Rome liberated the captive, struck off the chains of the serf, cheered the oppressed, and struck terror into the hearts of tyrants. Protestants have admitted all this.

Though we have marked many other passages for animadversion, yet we must here close our imperfect notice of the present epoch.

1 P. 135, *et seq.*

Hosted by Google

III. CHURCH HISTORY.*

ARTICLE III.—THE REFORMATION AND SINCE.

Necessity of calm impartiality — Protestant and Catholic views of reformation — Wickliffe and Huss — Oriental languages — Foreign and British reformation — Luther and Carlostadt Curious anachronism — Luther and Episcopacy — Anglican branch of the reformation — "Scruples of Henry VIII." — The new Gospel light — The Anglican Pope — Royal prerogative predominant — Cromwell Vicar General — Base servility of first Anglican Bishops—Fisher and Moore — Burning Protestants and Catholics — Palmer's theory of Anglican reformation examined — Downright tyranny — Trait of noble independence — Edward VI. — Married clergy — *Improvements* of Anglican liturgy — Return to unity under Mary — Bull of St. Pius V. — Henry's divorce — Reformation in Ireland — How the Anglican church was *persecuted* in Ireland — Dr. Lingard's testimony and proofs — Anglican saints — Ridley — McCauley's portrait of Cranmer — A parallel — Infidelity of Protestant origin — Anglican infidels — Suppression of Anglican convocation — Church and state — Where Voltaire learned infidelity — Infideis in Protestant Europe — French clergy during the Revolution — Did the French Revolution make any *Protestant* martyrs? — Conclusion.

We have now reached the fifth and last epoch of Church History, according to Mr. Palmer's division. It embraces the period intervening between the year 1517, — the date of the reformation, *so called*, — and the year 1839, — when our historian's work was published.

This is the most important and exciting era of ecclesiastical history. It is difficult to approach it with that even temper of mind, which is absolutely necessary to form a right judgment on its many startling events. Men are too apt to view these through the medium of their preconceived opinions; and we are not at all astonished that our Oxford historian, who had already given so much evidence of deep prejudice, should here have exhibited himself the thorough partisan. He hazards the following opinion as to the general character of this whole period: —

"Fifthly, the epoch (1517 — 1839) when a reformation being called for, was resisted by those who ought to have promoted it; when the western Church became divided; and at length infidelity came to threaten universal destruction."[1]

We would have drawn a different picture altogether of the period in question. We would have designated it as the epoch when a reformation having been called for in a violent and tumultuous manner, — by persons too who wished, under pretext of reform, to undermine the ancient faith, and who could not agree among themselves as to the nature or measure of the reformation asked for; — the demand was met by the Church in

*A Compendious Ecclesiastical History, from the earliest period to the present time. By the Rev. William Palmer, M. A., of Worcester College, Oxford. With a Preface and Notes, by an American Editor. New York, 1841, republished. 1 Vol., 12mo. pp. 228.

1 P. 5. *sup cit.*

Hosted by Google

the only legal way, — by convening a general council to decide on the doctrinal points called in question, and to devise the most suitable remedies for existing evils in local discipline or morals; — when the decisions of this council having been rejected by those who had clamored for reform, and who had themselves appealed to its authority, these became estranged from the Church, and split up into sects almost innumerable; — and when finally the unsettling of faith, caused by this multiplication of sects, led men naturally to the frightful abyss of infidelity. This picture is much more conformable to the facts of history, even as Mr. Palmer reads them; and this we hope to prove in the course of the present paper.

Of Wickliffe and Huss, the boasted precursors of the reformation, our author writes as follows:

"Wickliffe had, in the preceding century, declaimed against the Popes and against several abuses, and he was closely followed by Huss and Jerome of Prague: but their opinions were mingled with much that was exceptionable, and they seem to have been unfitted rightly to conduct the mighty work of reformation."[1]

This is a very mild censure of men who were firebrands in society, and whose principles led directly to sedition, and to the breaking up of all social order. But still, mild as was the reproof, it seems greatly to have shocked the sensibility of Bishop Whittingham, who here drops this little note: "More ought to have been said of this great precursor of the reformation."[2] We think ourselves that the great Captain of the Lollards was treated with some neglect by the Puseyite historian; and merely to satisfy the bishop, we will here give a few, out of the many strange doctrines, broached by this great precursor of the reformation. They are taken, almost at random, from a list of forty-five propositions extracted from his writings, and condemned in the council of Constance,[3] in 1415.

"Prop. IV. If a bishop or priest be in the state of mortal sin, he does not validly ordain, nor consecrate, nor administer the sacraments, nor baptize.

"Prop. VI. God ought to obey the devil. (!)[4]

"Prop. XXVII. All things happen through absolute necessity.

"Prop. XXIX. Universities, places for study, colleges, taking out degrees, (*graduationes*) and professorships, were borrowed from paganism, and are of as much profit to the Church as the devil. (!)

"Prop. XXXII. To endow the clergy is against the law of Christ.

"Prop. XLIII. Oaths are unlawful, when they are taken to confirm contracts among men, or for commercial purposes."

We wish the bishop much joy of his "great precursor," who seems to have had a wonderful taste for letters, and to have taken a strange fancy for the evil one! The bishop would do well, before he attempt to administer the sacraments in future, or to make his visitation, to examine

1 P. 146. 2 Ibid. 3 Sessione VIII. 4 Deus debet obedire diabolo.

Hosted by Google

carefully whether he be in the state of sin, otherwise his acts might be wholly invalid ; and if he have any worldly gear, we would advise him by all means to give it to the poor without delay, as he would be else sinning against the law of Christ!

Among the causes which prepared the way for the reformation, Mr. Palmer places the following : —

"The introduction of the Greek and Hebrew languages (entirely unknown during the middle ages) rendered the study of the Scriptures in the original languages possible."[1]

In the assertion made in *parenthesis*, there is either a woful ignorance of history, or a willful misstatement. The Oxford divine may select between these two horns of the dilemma : — there is no escape. We might accumulate evidence to prove, that not only the Greek and Hebrew, but other oriental languages, were cultivated to a considerable extent during the middle ages. Is Mr. Palmer ignorant of the fact, that Cassiodorus, as early as the sixth century, revived the study of Greek literature in Italy, and that Theodorus, archbishop of Canterbury, introduced the same study into England, in the seventh century ? *Can* he have been ignorant that many men, during that whole period, copied and collated the Greek and Hebrew manuscripts of the holy Scriptures ? Has it wholly escaped him, that, about the year 1285, Pope Honorius IV., founded, in the university of Paris, a distinct professorship for the cultivation of the oriental languages, with a view to prepare missionaries for the provinces of Asia;[2] and that Pope Clement V., in 1311, founded professorships of Hebrew, Greek, Arabic, and Syriac ? How, in fact, could the missions of the east, which we know flourished greatly in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, have been carried on at all, without an extensive acquaintance with the oriental languages ?

Our historian speaks very differently of what he calls the "foreign reformation,"[3] and of that which took place in the British churches. He finds much to censure in the former, more however as to its manner than its matter ; the latter is entirely after his own heart. We said in our first paper, that his book was Church History set to Puseyism ; and his whole account of the reformation, both on the continent and in England, affords a clear proof of our assertion. He grievously misstates on almost every page. We have not space to notice, much less to refute *all* his errors in matters of fact. We will briefly unfold his theory, and then advert to some of his more egregious blunders.

He laments the manner in which the foreign reformation commenced:—

"At length the reformation began; but not as it could have been desired ; not promoted by the heads of the church, not regulated by the decrees of councils."[4]

1 Pages 146—7.

2 It is but fair, however, to say, that this design of the enlightened Pontiff was not immediately carried into full execution, at least in the university of Paris.

3 That in Germany, and on the continent of Europe.

4 P. 174.

Hosted by Google

After having spoken of the papal bull against Luther, he remarks:—

"Luther and his friends Melancthon, Carlostadt, and all who were of the same sentiments, were thus separated from the communion of the Pope, and of his adherents in Germany not voluntarily, or by their own act."[1]

A little further on he says:—

"It is to be lamented, however, that the Lutherans after a time forgot that their system was merely provisional, and designed only to last till a general council could be lawfully assembled. They then began to pretend that their ancestors had separated *voluntarily* from the western church, and justified this act by reasons which sanctioned schism and separation generally."[2]

These passages exhibit the gist of his theory. Perhaps the reader will incline to the opinion, that the Lutherans were much better judges of their real position than the Oxford divine. If the latter has read history aright, he must have come to the conclusion, that Rome had exhausted every expedient of clemency and forbearance, ere she struck the blow which separated the adherents of Luther from the Catholic Church; and that even after the bull had been fulminated, she left no means untried to reclaim those deluded men who were obstinately bent on separation. For this purpose embassy after embassy was sent into Germany; nor did this commendable solicitude cease until after the year 1535, when the outrageous treatment by Luther of the legate Vergerio, sent by Pope Paul III., cut off all hopes of conciliation.[3] The appeal by Luther to a general council,— as the event proved,— was merely a crafty expedient to gain time: his real and fixed purpose, almost from the beginning, was to FORCE a separation from the Church; and not all the efforts of the Roman Pontiffs and of the general council of Trent subsequently convened, could prevent this unhappy result.

The reader, who is at all conversant with the history of those times, can scarcely repress a smile when he hears it gravely asserted, that "Luther and his friend Carlostadt were of the same sentiments." They agreed about as well as fire and water; and the same may be said of all the leading reformers. It would puzzle even a Puseyite to reconcile Mr. Palmer's assertion, that the bull of excommunication against Luther was fulminated in the year 1521,[4] with the notorious fact, that Luther had burned this same bull at Wittemberg on the 10th of December, in the previous year 1520! Still greater ingenuity would be required to reconcile our author's flippant assertion, that "episcopacy was never rejected by the Lutherans,"[5] with the certain fact, that Luther, the father of the sect, was violently opposed to it during his whole life, and wrote a most inflammatory work against it.[6] This, with some other works of a similar character, drew from the Protestant historian Hallam the pungent

1 Ibid. 2 P. 150. 3 See Audin's Life of Luther, p. 472, *et seq.*
4 P. 147. 5 P. 150.
6 *'Contra falso nominatum ordinem episcoporum.* Though leveled chiefly at the Catholic bishops, this violent pamphlet aims at nothing less than the destruction of the episcopacy itself.

Hosted by Google

remark, that the arch-reformer's writings were little more than "a bellowing in bad Latin."

For the special edification of Mr. Palmer's admirers, we will give one short extract from the publication of Luther just alluded to :

"Listen, bishops; listen, you vampires and devils! The Doctor comes to read for you a bull, which will make your ears tingle. The bull of Doctor Martin is this: whoever aids with his corporal strength, or with his property, to destroy the episcopacy, and slay the order of bishops, is a cherished child of God, and a good Christian. If he cannot do that, at least let him condemn and avoid this body. Whoever defends the episcopacy, or obeys its mandates, is a minister of Satan. Amen."[1]

We might remark on many other false or unfair statements of our historian in reference to the foreign reformation, for which, notwithstanding his dislike of some of its proceeedings, very feebly expressed, he evidently cherishes a sympathetic feeling, But we must hasten on to his account of the reformation effected in the "British churches," under which name he includes those of Ireland and Scotland. We have already remarked, that whenever his own dear England is concerned, he seems to become absolutely unsettled in mind: and we defy any one to read his very lengthy account of the progress of the reformation in England, Ireland, and Scotland, without being convinced that a little learning and much bigotry "have made him mad." He devotes two whole chapters,[2] extending through thirty-eight pages, to this portion of his history,—if that can be called a history, which is a tissue of false statements almost from beginning to end. His account of what he calls the "Irish church,"[3] is well worthy of the man, who had the heartlessness to write the atrocious libel on the Irish clergy and people, which sometime ago appeared in the London Quarterly Review. Its perusal is enough to make one's blood boil in his veins, even if those veins are not Irish.

He gravely tells us of the "scruples of Henry VIII. as to the lawfulness of his marriage with Catharine, the widow of his elder brother,"[4] and of the manner in which Pope Clement VII. "protracted the affair by various expedients for six years," for which course he can find no better motive than the influence of the Emperor Charles V., Catharine's uncle; and this wise delay of the Pontiff he can ascribe to naught but "the arts and chicanery of the court of Rome."[5] He next proceeds to state that Henry was sustained in his application for divorce by "the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Bologna, Padua, Orleans, Angiers, Bourges, Toulouse, &c., and by a multitude of theologians and canonists;" that the Pontiff still proving untractable, Henry "privately married Anna Boleyn," and that "the convocation of the church of England immediately afterwards declared his former marriage null, and approved that recently contracted."[6]

It is really difficult to have patience with a man, who thus glaringly

1 Cf Audin *ut sup.* p. 248. 2 Chapters xxii and xxiii, from p. 157 to 195.
3 P 167, *et seq.* 4 P. 158. 5 P. 158—9. 6 Ibid.

Hosted by Google

perverts, or miscolors the plainest facts of history. The *scruples* of Henry the VIII., forsooth! The *scruples* of the man, who was subsequently the murderer of his wives, and the unmitigated tyrant over his people! The *scruples* of the man, of whom it has been truly said, "that he never spared man in his anger, nor woman in his lust!" The *scruples* of the man, who wantoned in the sacrilegious spoliation of the monasteries and sanctuaries of religion, and whom all impartial men of every shade of opinion have long since branded as the Nero of the sixteenth century! The *scruples* of the man, who had already lived in perfect quietude of conscience with Catharine, the best of women and most virtuous of wives, for eighteen long years! She was a woman, too, whom even *he* could not accuse of any crime, except that of having grown old, and of having presented him no male issue;—a woman whom even *he* was compelled to respect to the hour of her death; whose gentleness, magnanimity, and piety, extorted homage from all her cotemporaries and from all posterity; and whose death caused even *him* to relent, to drop the unwilling tear, and to order his whole court to go into mourning!

And then, how did these pretended scruples awaken in his mind, after having lain dormant for so many years? How did the new gospel light break upon his hitherto clouded soul? How did he become so very scrupulous all of a sudden? Alas! it is useless to disguise the fact; all history proclaims it, and Henry's own conscience proclaimed it to him at the time. As the poet has caustically, but truly said,—

"The gospel light
First beamed from Anna Boleyn's eyes!"

Tired of an aged and virtuous wife, the royal founder of Anglicanism panted for new nuptials with another, whose youthful charms had already captivated his heart, and whose wily arts had rendered her inexorable to his wishes, except on the condition of supplanting the lawful queen, and becoming herself his queenly consort. The Pontiff was appealed to, to second the plan of the English king, and to grant the necessary dispensation: but the Popes had never flattered the vices of princes; and in this particular instance, Clement VII. would not consent to sacrifice his conscience, to trample upon the holy laws of God, and to be recreant to his duty towards a virtuous and much injured woman. After protracting the affair for some years, during which he tried every possible means to dissuade Henry from his purpose, he was at length compelled to decide against the divorce, on which the English king had already resolved. Henry became indignant; he sacrilegiously usurped the office of head of the Church in England; and the majority of the English bishops, won over by intrigue, worn out by harassing solicitations, or intimidated by menaces, were weak enough to sanction his wicked conduct.

Such is the true history of the origin of the Anglican church. We

Hosted by Google

wish it joy of its first founder and *pope;* — for Henry usurped the office of Pope in England, seized on the first fruits of the benefices which had hitherto been paid to the Roman Pontiffs, and pushed his *papal* prerogative much farther than ever Pope had done before. Instead of the mild and paternal authority of the Roman Pontiffs, who had ever been the champions of the poor and of the oppressed against the rich and tyrants, the Anglican bishops had now to wear, rivited on their necks, an iron yoke which they themselves had aided to forge. The sovereigns of England, whether male or female, whether infants or of mature age, whether sane in mind or idiotic, thus became absolute both in church and state! The only barrier to their tyranny was removed, and the liberties of England, which had been established by Catholics three hundred years before, now lay prostrate and crushed.

The champions of freedom, both civil and religious, were now doomed to atone for their rashness with their blood. The royal prerogative now became unlimited in its extent; it swallowed up every other element of government; and the parliament of England, once the fearless advocate of popular rights, now crouched with mean servility at the foot of a tyrant! And England had to pass through all the horrors of repeated civil wars and oceans of bloodshed, for one hundred and fifty years, ere the kingly power could be again restrained within its ancient constitutional limits, and her parliament could again assert the independence, which had so strongly marked its proceedings in the good old days of Catholicity.

This picture is not only not exaggerated, but it even falls short of the truth, as any one must be convinced who has but glanced at the pages of English history. Mr. Palmer tells us: —

"The convocation of the clergy in 1531 had acknowledged the king to be head of the Church of England, as far as it is allowable by the law of God;"[1] and that "in virtue of this office, which Henry seems to have understood in a different sense from that of the convocation, he appointed Lord Cromwell his vicar general and visiter of monasteries," &c.[2]

A small portion of the truth here leaks out. Had he been disposed to tell the *whole* truth, he would have stated, that this same Lord Cromwell, from having been the son of a fuller, had, by pandering to Henry's passion, become the first lord of the realm, — placed over the heads of all the princes both spiritual and temporal, and second only to the king himself! He would have told us of the unworthy arts, by which this creeping creature slandered the inmates of the monasteries, and thus succeeded in seizing on their immense property; a large portion of which he embezzled to his own uses, or that of his associates in the sacrilegious robbery. He would have told us, how this same lay vicar general lorded it over the bishops, and compelled them to resign their

1 P. 160. 2 Ibid.

Hosted by Google

authority, and to sue out new episcopal powers from the crown:[1] how those bishops were servile enough to submit to this exaction, and humbly to lay their mitres at the foot of the throne; and how the royal letters patent, which contained the strange new episcopal commission, assigned as a reason for this *indulgence* granted to the bishops, "that the king's vicar general, on account of the multiplicity of business with which he was loaded, could not be every where present, and that many inconveniences might arise, if delays and interruptions were admitted in the exercise of his authority."[2]

Alas! for the sycophancy of the first Anglican bishops. How it contrasts with the undaunted courage of the English bishops in the good old Catholic times! Where was then the spirit of an Anselm, of a Langton, and of a Thomas à Becket? Was there no *man* among the English bishops of that day? There was one, and but one, — we are pained to avow it, — a venerable octogenarian, the cherished counselor of Henry's father, and his own early preceptor, Fisher, bishop of Rochester: — honor to his gray hairs! *He* would not sacrifice his conscience at the bidding of a tyrant: and his head, which would not bow to an unholy despotism, was struck off by order of Henry! The despot had the heartlessness to taunt this venerable man, who in consideration of his transcendent merits had just been named cardinal by Pope Paul III., with this inhuman jeer: "Paul may send him the hat, I will take care that he have never a head to wear it on."[3]

Another illustrious hero, perhaps the greatest man then in England, fell a victim to Henry's tyranny. Sir Thomas Moore, lately lord chancellor of England, would not subscribe to the new doctrine of the king's supremacy. After a mock trial, in which all the forms of law were openly set at defiance, he was condemned to die the death of a traitor. And this hard lot befel every man, who had the conscience and the courage to resist Henry's will, in this or in any other particular! Protestants and Catholics were tied together and burnt at the same stake, if they ventured to believe more or less than suited the royal standard. No one *can*, or will even *dare* deny these facts; and yet we hear men coolly talking of Henry's scruples!

Is it possible, that a church, which originated under these circumstances, was the Church of Christ? Is it credible, that that was the Church of Christ, which came into existence at the bidding of a tyrant, which changed in each successive reign according to the royal pleasure and the will of the parliament, and the liturgy of which was moulded and remoulded, time and again, according to the caprice of the sovereign, male or female, who chanced to be reigning at the time?

We know now what value to set on the oft repeated assertion of our author, that by the general consent and voice of the English bishops and clergy, "the ordinary jurisdiction of the Pope over England was

1 See Lingard's History of England — Henry VIII., p. 178. First American edition. Philadelphia, 1827. 2 Ibid. 3 Lingard, ibid. p. 171.

Hosted by Google

regularly and lawfully suppressed."[1] This is, in fact, according to his theory, the distinguishing feature of the English reformation; this the greatest boast of its advocates. These contend that the English church reformed itself by its own free and spontaneous act; and that in asserting its independence of Rome it merely re-established its ancient rights. We have already seen how entirely unfounded is the pretension set forth in the last clause. It is easy to show that the other assertion, on which the theory mainly rests, is a mere assumption, wholly unsustained by evidence.

Was that a *free* consent, which was extorted by menaces, backed by the halter and the stake? Was that a regular and lawful proceeding, which was every where marked by violence? The English bishops had but the alternative; to subscribe to the supremacy of Henry, or to lay their heads on the block. Most of them chose the former, yet not without great and manifest reluctance. The opposition to the arbitrary proceedings of the king and of his vicar general, was both wide spread and deeply seated; but its murmurs were soon stifled in the blood of those who thus had the courage even to whisper dissent.

To silence this opposition, Henry issued injunctions "that the very word *Pope* should be carefully erased out of all books employed in the public worship; that every schoolmaster should diligently inculcate the new doctrine to the children entrusted to his care; that all clergymen, from the bishop to the curate, should on every Sunday and holiday teach that the king was the true head of the Church; and that the authority hitherto exercised by the Popes was a usurpation, tamely admitted by the carelessness or timidity of his predecessors; and that the sheriffs in each county should keep a vigilant eye over the conduct of the clergy, and should report to the council the names, not only of those who might neglect these duties, but also of those who might perform them indeed, but *with coldness and indifference*."[2]

Was there ever tyranny like this? We know of scarcely a parallel to it, save in the similar proceedings which were adopted towards the bishops and clergy in the subsequent reigns of Edward VI. and Elizabeth. If there is any truth in history, or any reliance to be put in the statute book of England, the whole reformation in that country was the offspring of guilty passion, and the work of violence and tyranny. Had there been in that kingdom a greater number of such men as Fisher and Moore, or had the English bishops possessed aught of the spirit which did so much honor to many of the monks, the bluff old tyrant, Henry, and his mischievous and barren progeny,—Edward and Elizabeth—might have been foiled in their wicked attempt to break up Christian unity.

Every one knows the noble reply of the two friars, Peyto and Elstow, to the barbarous threat of Cromwell—"that they deserved to be enclosed

1 P. 160

2 Statute 26 Henry VIII., 1, 3, 13. Wilk. Con. iii. 780—782. Apud Lingard. *ibid.* p. 168.

Hosted by Google

in a sack and thrown into the Thames." "Threaten these things," they said, "to rich and dainty folk, which are clothed in purple, fare deliciously, and have their chiefest hopes in this world. We esteem them not. We are joyful, that for the discharge of our duty we are driven hence. With thanks to God, we know that the way to heaven is as short by water as by land, and therefore care not which way we go."[1]

We have not a doubt, that had the monasteries in England been less wealthy, they would never have been suppressed; and that the body of English bishops would never have apostatized as they did, had they not unhappily belonged to the class of "rich and dainty folk." The wealth munificently bestowed on the Church by Catholic piety during the middle ages, and which, before the reformation, had been employed in erecting noble edifices to religion and to charity, thus became ultimately injurious in its influence on the English church. It was a rich bait to the avarice of those who clamored for reform, and the fear of its loss was a powerful inducement to the bishops and higher clergy to side with Henry VIII. The apostacy once consummated, this same mass of wealth was a golden chain of iniquity, which strongly and sweetly bound the Anglican bishops to the new order of things.

And we really know of no means by which the Anglican church can be again restored to Catholic unity, but the breaking of this same chain by the state, and the abandonment of that church to its own resources. Timid Puseyism would then probably ripen into open Catholicism; its crooked ways would then be made straight; and its many tortuous windings would give place to the one straight path which leads to the holy city of God. Till the English church establishment be broken up, — till this great fountain of evil be removed, we are far from being sanguine in the hope, that England is likely to return to the bosom of Catholic unity. Here and there, a disinterested and generous individual may break his chains, and assert his independence of a corrupt establishment; but, at least humanly speaking, we see little reason to believe that this blessed result will become general in England.

We should be endless were we to notice all the unfounded and absurd statements of our author on the English reformation. He says:

"On the death of Henry VIII., in 1547, and the accession of Edward VI., the work of the reformation proceeded freely. . . . . The clergy were permitted to marry, and the public prayers were translated from the old Latin offices of the English church, with various improvements(!) from the Greek and oriental liturgies."[2]

The permission of the clergy to marry was a decided improvement, not only on the ancient discipline of the Catholic Church, but also on the example and earnest advice of St. Paul.[3] Henry VIII., though he dearly prized the privilege of a young wife for himself, was so cruel as

1 Apud Lingard, *ibid.* p. 169. 2 P 161. 3 See 1 Cor. vii, entire chapter.

Hosted by Google

to deny this indulgence to his clergy;[1] but the "boy king," it seems, was more tender-hearted!

The improvements in the English liturgy were indeed many and various: first, the idea of the real presence and of a true sacrifice, which had been deemed essential to every previous liturgy, whether Latin, Greek, or Oriental, was carefully excluded; and secondly, the liturgy itself was studiously *amended* at least three times, just as the English parliament happened to become more enlightened! There was surely no lack of improvement!

It is really curious to observe, how our author laments the return of the Anglican church to Catholic unity under Mary.[2] The voluntary consent of the parliament and bishops; which had "regularly and lawfully" suppressed the power of the Pope, was incompetent, it seems, to restore that same power: the bishops who were then put into the sees which had been desecrated by intruders under the reign of Edward VI., were themselves but "popish intruders," who, under the "illustrious Elizabeth, were expelled by the civil power:"[3] and under this *virgin* queen, the Church of England was again established on a permanent basis! We scarcely have so poor an opinion of Mr. Palmer's intellect, as to suppose, even for a moment, that he could really have been serious while writing out these palable absurdities.

If any thing can surpass the cool assurance of the following passages, we must say, that we have not chanced to meet with it in all our reading. We give them for what they are worth; merely premising, that in the first he is speaking of the bull of St. Pius V., which excommunicated Elizabeth and her adherents: —

"This bull caused the schism in England; for the popish party, which had continued in communion with the Church of England up to that time, during the eleven past years of Elizabeth's reign, now began to separate themselves. Bedingfield, Cornwallis, and Silyarde, were the first popish recusants; and the date of the Romanists in England, as a distinct sect or community, may be fixed in the year 1570."

"King James I. wisely (!) discouraged the Roman schism, and forbade the residence of its bishops, priests, and Jesuits in his dominions; but under his successor Charles I., a relaxation of this wholesome severity encouraged the schismatics to insult and disturb the Church, and ultimately, in 1641, to massacre in cold blood one hundred and fifty thousand of its adherents, and to break into insurrection."[4]

We had also intended to insert here another extract[5] breathing a similar spirit, in which Mr. Palmer clearly approves of the late high-handed tyranny of the king of Prussia in imprisoning some Catholic bishops; and we had also purposed to examine his flippant statements in regard to the opinions of the universities in the matter of Henry's divorce. But want of space compels us to omit the former, and for the latter, we must be content with a reference, in the margin, to Dr. Lingard's

1 Cranmer, however, outwitted him in this.

2 P. 162. 3 P. 163. 4 P. 170. 5 P. 200.

Hosted by Google

luminous proofs on the subject.[1] He abundantly establishes the fact, that the opinions of all the universities, including the two in England, were obtained by bribery, or were reluctantly given, after the practising, by Henry's agents, of the vilest arts and the lowest trickery.

We must hasten on in our rapid notice of Mr. Palmer's statements. He devotes four pages[2] to an account of the "churches of Ireland," — and such an account! We sincerely believe that there is nothing to equal it, in reckless mendacity and utter atrocity, in all the volumes which the press has sent forth since it was first put in operation. He begins his history of the reformation in Ireland, in these words:

"The churches of Ireland have been suffering severely from the persecutions of Romanists for many years past."

And he ends it with this memorable passage:

"From that period (1798), the Romish party has acquired great political power, and the church has been almost continually persecuted, especially within the last few years, in which the clergy have been reduced nearly to starvation; some have been murdered, and many placed in peril of their lives. To add to their afflictions, the government, in 1833, suppressed ten of the bishoprics on pretense of requiring their revenues for the support of ecclesiastical buildings; although the bishops of Ireland in a body protested against such an act, and offered to pay the amount required from the incomes of their sees, provided that so great an injury were not done to the cause of religion."[3]

The reader may judge of the spirit which pervades the whole account from these two specimens. Only think of it! The miserable faction of self-called reformers, which was thrust upon Ireland by open violence, and by that government too which has ever been the most deadly enemy of her dearest rights, both temporal and eternal; — the faction which has, for the last three hundred years, been sitting, like an *incubus*, upon the green ocean Isle, weighing down her energies, and crushing her people in the dust; — the faction which has been draining her treasure, and, vampire like, sucking her very blood; — the faction which has sowed religious dissensions and civil feuds broadcast on her lovely soil; — the faction which has reveled in the misery and wretchedness of her people, and wantoned in the blood of her murdered sons and daughters: — this same miserable faction now has the effrontery to stand forth, and unblushingly to cry out persecution! O shame! O shame!!

If it was a bitter curse for Ireland, when the Saxon first set foot upon her green soil, it was a curse a hundred fold more dreadful, when the myrmidons of the reformation seized on and desecrated her beautiful churches, and after having plundered them and destroyed her monasteries and houses of education, sat down with complacency amidst the ruins they had caused. And now, for the children of these sacrilegious spoilers of all that she deemed sacred and held dear, to have the assu-

1 History of England — Henry VIII. — p. 135, *et. seq.*, and note D.
2 P. 167, *et. seq.* 3 P. 170

Hosted by Google

rance to come forth, and to taunt her, whom they have so atrociously injured, with persecution, is really too bad, — it is intolerable. The less the Anglican church says about its doings in Ireland, the better for its advocates. The very name of Ireland should raise a blush upon the cheek of every Anglican, — if English Protestant cheeks *can* blush for any atrocity of which England has been guilty towards that unhappy country.

It would be easy for us to prove, that almost every important statement which our author makes on this subject, is not only wholly unfounded, but utterly false. We will notice only a few out of many. Of the first attempt to introduce the reformation into Ireland, under Henry VIII., he says:

"Henry VIII. caused the papal jurisdiction to be abolished, in 1537, by the parliament (Irish). The bishops and clergy generally assented (!) and several reforms (!) took place during this and the next reign." [1]

Dr. Lingard, himself an Englishman, proves by incontestable evidence, that "Henry's innovations in religion were viewed with equal abhorrence by the indigenous Irish, and the descendants of the English colonists;" that the parliament which abolished the jurisdiction of the Pope was not the true representative of Irish opinion, but the mere echo of English feelings,— a miserable body of mere creatures of the English court, which "one day confirmed the marriage of the king with Anne Boleyn, and the next, in consequence of the arrival of a courier, declared it to have been invalid from the beginning;" that it was impossible to enforce among the Irish people this parliamentary enactment; and that "the two races combined in defence of their common faith," causing "repeated insurrections." [2] All this he proves from the Irish statute book, and from other authentic documents; and, so far as we know, his statement on this subject has never been controverted; his proofs have certainly never been met, nor his arguments answered.

Our author tells us, that —

"When Elizabeth succeeded, the former laws were revived, the papal power again rejected, and the royal supremacy and the English ritual again introduced. These regulations were approved by seventeen out of nineteen Irish bishops in the parliament of 1560, and by the rest of the bishops and clergy who took the oath of supremacy, and remained in the possession of their benefices. The people also generally acquiesced, and continued to attend on divine service for several years." [3]

We unhesitatingly pronounce all that is contained in the two last sentences utterly untrue, which qualification we apply with still greater emphasis to almost everything that follows on the subject. Dr. Lingard shows from the statute book of Ireland, that "both the nobility and the people abhorred the change in religion, and that the new statutes were carried into execution in those places only where they *could be enforced*

1 Page 167. 2 History of England—Henry VIII.—pp. 246, 247. 3 Page 167.

Hosted by Google

at the point of the bayonet."[1] Even the heartless tyrant, Henry VIII., could not, either by menaces or bribery, induce more than one of the Irish bishops to apostatize,—Brown, archbishop of Dublin,—and he was an Englishman by birth.[2] Under Edward VI., this supple courtier-prelate induced four other Irish bishops to become as reckless as himself;[3] but in both cases, the archbishops of Armagh,—Cromer and Dowdal,—as well as the great body of the Irish bishops, and clergy remained faithful to the ancient Church and the holy See. Is it to be believed, that during the intervening reign of the Catholic Queen Mary, the Irish Catholic bishops became more inclined to apostatize?

Mr. Palmer devotes an entire chapter[4] to rather lengthy sketches of the lives of various Anglican *saints* and divines. Nicholas Ridley, *the martyr*, stands at the head of the list. He winds up his account of this man with the following pious rhapsody:

"Thus died the illustrious martyr—or rather thus did he enter eternal life; and it may be said with truth that never, since the days of the apostles, was there a nobler manifestation of Christian faith and heroism. It was worthy of the brightest days of the primitive Church; and not even Polycarp, in the amphitheater of Smyrna, exceeded the glory of Nicholas Ridley."[5]

We apprehend that Polycarp did not change his religious creed, like Ridley; nor, like him, assist in persecuting others for believing more or less than himself. Lingard tells us, on the authority of the State Papers and of Wilkins, that "as under Henry VIII. Ridley had been employed to examine and detect sacramentaries, so, under the son of Henry. (Edward VI.,) he sate in judgment on the condemnation of heretics.'[6] We nowhere read that Polycarp retracted his belief to save his life, as Ridley did in prison;[7] much less that he ever turned traitor to his lawful sovereign, and sought to stir up civil war. It was for this crime of treason chiefly, that Ridley suffered death. He had preached openly against Queen Mary, at St. Paul's Cross, London; and he was one of the most influential of those traitors who assisted in setting up the unfortunate Lady Jane Grey. He may do for an Anglican saint; he could never pass the rigid ordeal requisite for canonization in the Catholic Church.

By the way, why did not Mr. Palmer let us have a sketch of the great patriarch of Anglicanism,—a sort of spiritual vicar general under Henry VIII., and the ever pliant tool of this real founder of the Anglican church,—Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury? Was this unscrupulous courtier too bad to be placed even on the calendar of Protestant saints? Was the Oxford divine frightened by the striking likeness drawn of him by the distinguished Protestant

1 Elizabeth, p. 95. Irish Statutes, 2 Eliz. 1, 2, 3.
2 Lingard, *sup cit.*—Henry VIII.—p. 246. 3 Ibid.—Edward VI.—p. 78. 4 Chap. xxiii.
5 Page 179. 6 History of England, vol. vii, p. 195. Edit. Dolman, London, 1845.
7 He subsequently retracted this retraction, and died with courage.

Hosted by Google

writer, Macaulay? He was almost as great a saint as Ridley; in fact, in many respects the former far outstripped the latter.

We subjoin Macaulay's estimate of the English reformation in general, and of the character of Cranmer in particular. :—

"They (the English Reformers) were,—a king, whose character may be best described, by saying, that he was despotism itself personified; unprincipled ministers; a rapacious aristocracy; a servile parliament. Such were the instruments by which England was delivered from the yoke of Rome. The work, which had been begun by Henry, the murderer of his wives, was continued by Somerset, the murderer of his brother; and completed by Elizabeth, the murderer of her guest.

"If we consider Cranmer merely as a statesman, he will not appear a much worse man than Wolsey, Gardiner, Cromwell, or Somerset; but when an attempt is made to set him up as a saint, it is scarcely possible for any man of sense, who knows the history of the times well, to preserve his gravity. The shameful origin of his history, common enough in the scandalous chronicles of courts, seems strangely out of place in a hagiology. Cranmer rose into favor by serving Henry in the disgraceful affair of his first divorce. He promoted the marriage of Anna Boleyn with the king. On a frivolous pretence, he pronounced it null and void. On a pretence, if possible still more frivolous, he dissolved the ties which bound the shameless tyrant to Anne of Cleves. He attached himself to Cromwell, while the fortunes of Cromwell flourished; he voted for cutting off his head without a trial, when the tide of royal favor turned. He conformed backwards and forwards, as the king changed his mind. While Henry lived, he assisted in condemning to the flames those who denied the doctrine of transubstantiation; when Henry died, he found out that the doctrine was false. He was, however, not at a loss for people to burn. The authority of his station, and of his gray hairs, was employed to overcome the disgust, with which an intelligent and virtuous child regarded persecution.

"Intolerance is always bad; but the sanguinary intolerance of a man who thus wavered in his creed, excites a loathing to which it is difficult to give vent, without calling foul names. Equally false to political and to religious obligations, he was first the tool of Somerset, and then the tool of Northumberland. When the former wished to put his own brother to death, without even the form of a trial, he found a ready instrument in Cranmer. In spite of the canon law, which forbade a churchman to take any part in matters of blood, the archbishop signed the warrant for the atrocious sentence. When Somerset had been, in his turn, destroyed, his destroyer received the support of Cranmer in his attempt to change the course of the succession.

"The apology made for him by his admirers, only renders his conduct more contemptible. He complied, it is said, against his better judgment, because he could not withstand the entreaties of Edward! A holy prelate of sixty, one would think, might be better employed by the bedside of a dying child, than in committing crimes at the request of his disciple. If he had shown half as much firmness when Edward requested him not to commit murder, he might have saved the country from one of the greatest misfortunes that it ever underwent. He became, from whatever motive, the accomplice of the worthless Dudley. The virtuous scruples of another young and amiable mind were to be overcome. As Edward had been forced into persecution, Jane was to be seduced into usurpation. No transaction in our annals is more

Hosted by Google

unjustifiable than this. To the part which Cranmer, and unfortunately some better men than Cranmer, took in this most reprehensible scheme, much of the severity with which Protestants were afterward treated, must, in fairness, be ascribed.

"The plot failed, Popery triumphed, and Cranmer recanted. Most people look upon his recantation as a single blemish on an honorable life,—the frailty of an unguarded moment. But, in fact, it was in strict accordance with the system on which he had constantly acted. It was a part of a regular habit. It was not the first recantation that he had made; and in all probability, if it had answered his purpose, it would not have been the last. We do not blame him for not choosing to be burnt alive. It is no very severe reproach to any person, that he does not possess heroic fortitude. But, surely, a man who liked the fire so little, should have had some sympathy for others. A persecutor who inflicts nothing which he is not ready to endure, deserves some respect; but, when a man who loves his doctrine more than the lives of his neighbors, loves his own little finger better than his doctrines, a very simple argument *a fortiori*, will enable us to estimate the amount of his benevolence.

"But his martyrdom, it is said, redeemed everything. It is extraordinary, that so much ignorance should exist on this subject. The fact is, if a martyr be a man who chooses to die rather than renounce his opinions, Cranmer was no more a martyr than Dr. Dodd. He died solely because he could not help it. He never retracted his recantation, till he found he had made it in vain. If Mary had suffered him to live, we suspect that he would have heard mass, and received absolution like a good Catholic, till the accession of Elizabeth; and that he would then have purchased, by another apostacy, the power of burning men better and braver than himself."

In this whole matter of Anglican saints, we cannot fail to observe, even in the highly-wrought portraits of our author, a sad want of those qualities which, in the Catholic times, invariably marked the true saint:—humility of heart and action, mortification, disinterestedness, self-devotion, penitential austerities,—such as fasting, long prayers and corporal maceration,—and an entire abstraction from the world.

Mr. Palmer himself furnishes us ample materials for making this comparison. Let the reader only peruse his well-written sketches of the lives of Saints Francis Xavier, Charles Borromeo, Francis de Sales, and Vincent de Paul,[1] and compare their lives and conduct, as there set forth, with the lives and conduct of the Anglican saints alluded to, and he will at once detect which is the genuine, and which the counterfeit. We wish that our limits permitted us to make the comparison in full; but we must forego this pleasure, and leave the readers of Mr. Palmer's book to make it for themselves.

There is, however, one point on which we must dwell for a few moments, ere we bid a final adieu to Mr. Palmer's "Compendious Ecclesiastical History;" we mean the downward tendency of Protestantism, even of Anglican Protestantism, as admitted by himself. Catholic writers have often declared that infidelity is of Protestant origin; and we would ask no better proofs of this assertion than those

1 Chapter xxv.

Hosted by Google

afforded by our historian's own avowals. We will allege a few of his testimonies bearing on this point. He speaks of the practical tendency of Lutheranism as follows:

"In the middle of the following century (the eighteenth), a spirit of false liberality and skepticism began to infect the Lutheran communities. The Confession of Augsburg, and other formularies of the sixteenth century, to which their ministers had subscribed, lost their authority, and an unbounded freedom of opinion on all points was encouraged. The result was, the rise of a party headed by the notorious Semler, who, under the mask of Christianity, explained away all the doctrines of revelation, denied the miracles and other facts of sacred history, and subverted the genuineness and authenticity of the Bible. This infidelity became dreadfully prevalent among the Protestants of Germany and Denmark, in the course of the last and present centuries; the universities were full of it, the ministers of religion tainted with it; and the Lutheran faith seems under an eclipse, from whence we fervently pray that it may be delivered." [1]

The Calvinistic branch of the reformation did not bear any better fruits. Here is Mr. Palmer's testimony:

"It may be observed, in general, of the reformed communities in Switzerland, France, and the United Provinces, that they have too generally fallen away from the doctrines originally believed by them, into the Socinian or Arian heresies." [2]

One would have thought, that at least the hopeful branch of the reformation, established by parliament, and by the bayonet,[3] halter, and stake in England, would not have suffered a similar degeneracy. Let us hear what our historian says on this subject,—and surely *he* is an unexceptionable witness.

"In 1717, a controversy arose on occasion of the writings of Hoadley, bishop of Bangor, in which he maintained that it was needless to believe any particular creed, or to be united to any particular church; and that sincerity or our own persuasion of the correctness of our own opinions (whether well or ill founded), is sufficient. These doctrines were evidently calculated to subvert the necessity of believing the articles of the Christian faith, and to justify all classes of schismatics or separatists from the Church. The convocation deemed these opinions so mischievous, that a committee was appointed to select propositions from Hoadley's books, and to procure their censure; but before his trial could take place the convocation was prorogued by an arbitrary exercise of the royal authority, and has not been permitted to deliberate since. The temporal government, influenced by the schismatics, protected and advanced Hoadley and several persons of similar principles. In 1766, Archdeacon Blackburn, who was supposed to be an Arian, anonymously assailed the practice of subscribing the articles; and in 1772, a body of clergy and laymen petitioned parliament to put an end to it; but their request was refused. Many of these petitioners were secret disbelievers in some of the Christian doctrines." [4]

1 Pp. 150, 151. 2 P. 152.

3 In Edward's reign, German troops were employed to enforce the reformation, and to crush an extensive insurrection in Devonshire and Norfolk. 4 P. 165.

Hosted by Google

A humiliating avowal, truly, for an Anglican to be compelled to make! At one fell stroke the royal head of the Anglican church swept away forever the convocation of bishops; and for more than a hundred years, this boasted "church Catholic" has been voiceless, and a mere dumb slave, doomed to do the bidding of an inexorable task master. She has been well punished for having cast off, in an evil hour for her, the mild and paternal authority of Rome. She has, unlike the Israelites of old, gone out of the blooming land of the Catholic paradise, and entered again into the dark land of Egyptian servitude. She is a hopeless slave, bound hand and foot: she has no life even, but that which the capricious whim of her royal master or mistress may think proper to breathe into her nostrils! We do not wonder that she is beginning to grow weary of her bondage, and to sigh again for her former independence. It is, in fact, to this aspiration after spiritual freedom, that we are mainly indebted for the recent Oxford movement. Let us hear what Mr. Palmer, — who ought to know, — testifies on the matter in question: —

"The church has been suffering much for a long time from appointments to its offices made from unworthy motives. The bishopries and other dignities were[1] bestowed by the ministers of the crown on men distinguished only by birth or connections. Patronage, in general, was distributed on low and worldly considerations. Theological learning received no encouragement, and active zeal was viewed with jealousy as an approximation to Methodism . . . . The aspect of the times has since contributed to stimulate the activity of the church. The weakness of the temporal government, and the influence which parties hostile to the church have for the last twenty years exercised over it, have taught the church to depend less on the protection of the state than on the divine blessing," &c.[2]

God grant that the unholy alliance may be forever dissolved, and then we may hope for England's conversion!

It is curious to trace to its proper origin that modern infidelity which lately desolated France, and threatened to ingulf Christianity itself. Nothing is more certain than that it originated in the principles of Protestantism, and first in Protestant countries. Mr. Palmer himself will aid us in proving this position, and in establishing the two following propositions: —First, that in point of time, infidelity obtained a footing in England and Germany much sooner than it did in France; and second, that those who subsequently propagated it in France, had imbibed their false principles, and learned the specious sophistry by which they sought to maintain them, in Protestant England or Germany, but principally in England.

In support of the first proposition, the truth of which every one who has but glanced at history must admit, we have the authority of Mr. Palmer: —

"England had been already disgraced by the writings of some

1 *Have been* would have been, perhaps, more grammatical, and the same remark should be made as to the following clauses. 2 P. 166.

Hosted by Google

unbelievers; but the works of Herbert and Bolingbroke, of Collins and Trindal, had produced little effect on the good sense and religious principles of the English nation."[1]

We deem the latter assertion of very doubtful authority. It is well known that many of the bishops and clergy themselves, whom our author praises for their able advocacy of Christianity,[2] were tainted with infidel principles. Mr. Palmer admits all this, as we have already seen; and we have likewise heard how he speaks of rationalism and infidelity in Germany and other Protestant countries.

The second proposition is no less certain. It was in England, as the associate and boon companion of Bolingbroke and other English infidels, that Voltaire conceived his impious purpose of attempting the destruction of Christianity. This is a very important fact, for which we have again Mr. Palmer's testimony: —

"After he (Voltaire) had left college, he associated only with persons of infamous morals; and having published some infidel opinions, which gave offense to the ruling powers of France, he retired to England, where he became acquainted with several unbelievers like himself. *Here he formed his resolution to destroy Christianity;* and on his return to Paris in 1730, he made no secret of his design and his hopes."[3]

Here we perceive that a noxious weed, plucked from the fertile garden of Catholic France, was carefully replanted in England, where it was nurtured to maturity; whence it was again, in an evil day, transplanted into France. Voltaire plied the very arguments, and used almost the identical language, which had been employed, with so much effect by the early reformers, for exciting popular indignation against Rome. Let us hear our author: —

"Voltaire invited men to forsake their religion, by promising them liberty of thought. He declared that 'Nothing was so contemptible and miserable in his eyes, as to see one man have recourse to another in matters of faith, or to ask what he ought to believe.' Reason, liberty and philosophy, were continually in the mouths of Voltaire and D'Alembert."[4]

It is remarkable, that when Voltaire was again under the necessity of leaving France, he found an asylum in Protestant Prussia and Switzerland. There seemed to exist a certain congenial feeling between him and the leaders of the Protestant party.

Mr. Palmer bears evidence also to the rapid spread of infidel principles among the crowned heads and the higher orders, in most Protestant countries of Europe.

"Infidelity now spread rapidly through France and through every part of the continent of Europe; several of the crowned heads were more or less favorable. The empress of Russia; the kings of Prussia, Denmark, Poland, Sweden, and *all* the princes of Germany, were either admirers of Voltaire, or avowed infidels."[5]

Our historian scarcely does justice to the Catholic clergy of France

1 P. 219 2 Ibid. 3 Ibid. 4 P 220. 5 P. 221.

Hosted by Google

during the revolution; and he lays too much stress on the apostacy of a few among their number. Yet he cannot help avowing that —

"The majority of the Roman clergy throughout Europe retained their faith, and, under the most grievous afflictions and persecutions for the name of Christ, evinced an increased measure of zeal and piety."[1]

We doubt very much, whether the Protestant clergy of the Anglican establishment would have stood the fiery ordeal half so well. We never yet heard of one of these "rich and dainty folk," who coveted the crown of martyrdom, or who was willing to die when he could avoid it; though we have read of many among them, who with remarkable liberality, were willing to bestow upon others that crown which was too thorny for their own delicate brows. During the horrors of the French revolution, hundreds and thousands of the French clergy and of religious men and women cheerfully laid down their lives for the faith, in the midst of the most excruciating tortures; but we have not yet heard of *one* Protestant clergyman, who during that whole period received the crown of martyrdom. If there was *one*, history is wholly silent on the subject. How are we to explain this singular phenomenon, but on the ground that modern infidelity is the daughter of Protestantism,—a daughter degenerate indeed, but still cherishing a tender feeling for her parent.

We have now completed our very rapid notice of Palmer's "Compendious Ecclesiastical History." As we have already intimated more than once, we have been compelled to pass over in silence many things upon which we had originally intended to animadvert. Our limits have necessarily confined us to a very brief review of the more prominent assertions of the book. We think we have said enough, however, to enable our readers to form some idea of the Oxfordite's Ecclesiastical History, as well as of the accuracy, learning, and impartiality of his Right Reverend editor and note-maker.

1 P. 222.

Hosted by Google

IV. LITERATURE AND THE ARTS IN THE MIDDLE AGES.*

Importance of the subject — Writers who have treated it — Division — A Colossus falling — Incursions of the Northmen—A deluge — Beautiful Italy—Awful devastation — New dynasties — Christianity triumphant over barbarism—Civilization—Literary history—Tenth century—Gradual revival—Its causes—Golden age of Leo X.—Latin language in liturgy—And the Monastic institute — Elevation of woman — Modern languages—And Poetry—Paper—Art of Printing — Illuminated manuscripts—Universities—Schools of Law and Medicine—Musical Notes—Organs—Bells—Mariners' Compass—Geographical discoveries—Commerce—First Bank—Post-Office—Newspapers—Spectacles—Gunpowder—Stone Coal—Arithmetical Numbers—Algebra—Glass—Stained Glass—Agriculture—Botany—Clocks—Painting revived—Silk introduced—Gothic Style of Architecture—Leaning Tower of Pisa—Conclusion.

LITERATURE and the Arts during the middle ages supply a theme at once vast and important: vast, because it comprises a period of nearly one thousand years; and important, because it exhibits the rise and progress to perfection, of institutions intimately connected with civilization and political liberty. That period was the nursery of nations, the parent of civilization and of empire. From the partial chaos of those ages, sprang into existence systems of government, which, by their harmony and adaptation to the wants of mankind, are the admiration of the present century.

The attention of the literary world has been lately awakened to the importance of this subject. Italy, as usual, pioneered the way. About the middle of the last century, the learned Muratori published, in thirty huge folio volumes, the hitherto inedited works of the middle ages, to which he annexed copious and learned commentaries of his own. This herculean labor was followed by another work from the same author, in which this giant of modern literature spread out, in six large folio volumes of Essays, the results of his researches into the manners, customs, and antiquities of that period. The very vastness of this work, as well as the size of its tomes, would make one of our modern literati, who loves meager volumes with fine covers, shudder with horror! Muratori was followed by Tiraboschi, another illustrious Italian, whose classical and extensive History of Italian Literature, has, I think, no equal, and even no parallel in any other language. These works constitute a complete repertory, where the studious inquirer into the history of the middle ages may find all that he can reasonably ask for. Among the Germans who have labored to illustrate this subject, we may name Frederick and

* A Lecture delivered some years ago in Lexington, Ky.; and subsequently before the Catholic Institute of Baltimore and the Mechanics' Institute of Louisville, in 1854.

Hosted by Google

William Schlegel, Meiners,[1] Eichorn,[2] Heeren,[3]; and among more recent writers, Voigt and Hurter,[4] learned Protestant divines. The French have also done much in this field; it is sufficient for our purpose to name Michaud's History of the Crusades, and to allude to some learned articles in a periodical work now published in France,—and which would reflect honor on any country,—"The Annals of Christian Philosophy." Among English writers, Hallam and Maitland have, perhaps, succeeded better than any others; though their works, learned and excellent as they are in many respects, are but pigmies compared to some of those named above.

The beginning and end of the period called the Middle Ages, has been variously assigned by chronologists and historians. We prefer, as the most natural and conformable to the great outlines of history, the opinion which dates the commencement of that period from the downfall of the Roman Empire in the west in 476, and fixes its termination at the fall of the same in the east, in 1453,—a space of 977 years. The western empire, which had commenced with Augustus, terminated about 500 years afterwards in Augustulus, or the little Augustus; and the eastern, founded by Constantine the Great, when he removed the seat of empire from Rome to Constantinople in 330, terminated 1123 years afterwards in Constantine Paleologus, who might also be called with some propriety Constantine the little.

That the reader may more easily follow the remarks we have to make upon this subject, we will endeavor, 1st, to trace the causes which brought about the decline of Literature in those ages: 2dly, to present a rapid historical sketch of the literary condition at various epochs of the period in question: 3dly, to point out the causes which prompted the gradual rise of letters: and 4thly, to take a general survey of the subject, and to answer the question,—how much do we owe to those ages?

I. The causes of the partial decline of letters during the period of which we are speaking, must be obvious to every reader of history. They are almost identical with those agencies, which gradually weakened, and finally overthrew the Roman empire in the west. This vast Colossus, which stood with one foot upon the heart of Europe, and the other upon Asia, grasping with one hand northern Africa and with the other the Britains, was destined to share the fate of all earthly institutions. It trembled upon its base, tottered and fell,—the victim of its own vastness, and innate tendency to decay. The German and northern hordes had ever been the most formidable enemies of Rome. The same spirit seems to have animated the Goths and Vandals under Alaric and Genseric, Attila and Totila, as had many centuries before brought Brennus with his Gauls before the walls of Rome.

While Rome continued to be the seat of empire, the efforts of the Northmen through centuries proved unavailing. As often as they

1 Vergleichung der sitten, etc., des mittelalters mit denen unsers Jahrhunderts.
2 Allgemeine Geschichte der Cultur und Literatur.
3 Geschichte des studium der Classischen Literatur
4 Since become a Catholic.

Hosted by Google

attempted invasion, they were met by the Roman legions under an Adrian, a Marcus Aurelius, or a Septimius Severus, and were driven back to their northern fastnesses. But no sooner had Constantine removed the seat of government to Constantinople, than the western branch of the empire was devoted to destruction. Franks, Goths, Vandals, Visigoths, Ostrogoths, Alans, Huns, Lombards, Danes, and Normans, successively swept like torrents over the most beautiful provinces of Europe. Nothing could resist their force, or check their headlong career. They carried everything before them. They conquered but to destroy. They demolished almost everything; for more than two centuries they built up nothing.

From the year 400 to the year 600, was a sad period for Europe. The first conquerors did not occupy the soil which they had subdued; they pushed on to new conquests, or rather to new devastations. The territory they had last left was immediately invaded by another tribe more rapacious than themselves; and thus pushing each other on, as wave driving wave, they covered the face of Europe with the waters of a deluge of barbarism for centuries. It was only after the apparently inexhaustible population of the North had been almost drained, that the different tribes began to settle down permanently on the soil which they had hitherto only occasionally occupied.

Italy suffered most, as she was the favorite land with the Northmen; she was always aimed at because always beautiful,[1] as an Italian orator lately said; there was scarcely a tribe, which did not trample down her lovely fields and rich vineyards. During the brief space of twenty years, Rome was taken by assault and pillaged five times! Yet a late American writer has well said: —

"There was, in that period of general social dissolution one country, in which the work of devastation commenced much later, and ended much sooner. Italy in the middle ages was like Mt. Ararat in the Deluge, — the last reached by the flood and the first left. The remains of the Roman social world were either never utterly dispersed in that country, or far later than any where else; and if we are to date the close of the middle ages from the extinction of feudalism, that revolution was effected in Italy, no less than three centuries before the time of Charles V. — the epoch assumed by Hallam, as the conclusion of his work. It would then, perhaps, be expedient to refer the history of Europe in the middle ages to Italy, as the history of the ancient world has always been referred to Rome. The great ascendency of the papal power, and the influence of Italian genius on the literature and the fine arts of all countries, made Italy essentially the center of light — the sovereign of thought — the Capital of Civilization!"[2]

The justice of this tribute to Italy is confirmed by Hallam, who says:

"It may be said with some truth, that Italy supplied the fire from which other nations in this first, as afterwards in the second era of the

1 "Sempre bersagliata, perche sempre bella."
2 North American Review, 1840 — Art. Hallam's Middle Ages.

Hosted by Google

revival of letters, lighted their own torches. Lanfranc, Anselm, Peter Lombard, the founder of systematic theology in the twelfth century, Irnerius, the restorer of jurisprudence, Gratian, the author of the first compilation of canon law, the school of Salerno, that guided medical art in all countries, the first dictionaries of the Latin tongue, the first treatise of Algebra, the first great work that makes an epoch in Anatomy, are as truly and exclusively the boast of Italy, as the restoration of Greek literature and of classical taste in the fifteenth century."[1]

The Northmen not only arrested agriculture and pillaged cities, but they often destroyed libraries, and tore or defaced the finest monuments of Literature and the Arts. They spared nothing in their ruthless career of destruction. Occasionally, indeed, an Attila, calling himself "*the Scourge of God*," would pause with awe before a Leo the Great pleading with a divine energy, that his flock might be spared by the wolf; and even a Totila, the last ravager of Rome, (A. D. 554) would quail before the humble sanctity of a Benedict; but these are only exceptions to a general rule. Even the monasteries, those sanctuaries of learning, though often spared, were sometimes pillaged and destroyed. The famous monastery of Mt. Cassino, in Italy, to which even Totila had made a pilgrimage of reverence, was afterwards plundered by the Lombards, (A. D. 580).

The confusion of society, — the perpetual tumults which distracted Europe, the destruction of agriculture and manufactures, and the misery and wretchedness thereby induced, — the tears and cries of the widow and orphan, — and the other evils of that period, are feelingly deplored by cotemporaneous writers. So great was the distress in Europe, that about the beginning of the tenth century, many believed the end of the world was at hand.

These causes seemed to act with but little intermission, until towards the end of the tenth century, or during a period of nearly 500 years. It required this long period to enable Europe to settle down, and to become adapted to the new order of things, brought about by a series of revolutions till then unparalleled in history.

In the midst of continual agitation and revolution, men could not find time to apply to the cultivation of letters. From necessity, their hands were better trained to the use of the sword than to that of the pen. From the continual devastation of wars, books, which could then be multiplied only by the copyist, became exceedingly scarce. The venerable Alexandrian library was destroyed by the Saracens in 641, and its fate was unhappily shared by many other valuable libraries in Europe. Books were so dear that they could be procured only by the wealthy, precisely because they had become so scarce. A memorable instance of this occurs in the case of the Dutchess of Anjou, who for one copy of a book of Homilies, gave one hundred sheep and eighty bushels of wheat. The

1 Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries; 2 vols. 8vo; — Harper's Edition, vol. 1. p. 58.

Hosted by Google

loan of books itself, became sometimes a matter of diplomatic negotiation.

Another fact must be kept in view. Not only did new dynasties arise on the ruins of previous institutions, but a new race peopled Europe, with new manners, customs, laws, and religion; whilst the miserable remnant of the original population was reduced to a degrading vassalage. Who can wonder, if under these circumstances, literature declined? The great marvel is, that it was not entirely and forever prostrated. And but for the finger of God, acting through the divinely reactive energies of Catholic Christianity, we sincerely believe that this would have been the case.

Christianity was trampled in the dust by the armies of the infidel or semi-infidel[1] Northmen, but her divine spirit was not subdued. She conquered like her Founder, by being seemingly conquered for a time, by death! She bent her heavenly form to the tempest, but did not quail under its violence; and when its utmost fury had been spent, she raised her head, and exhibited her divine countenance and heavenly features to the barbarians who held her captive; — they paused, and, —

"God! how they admired her heavenly hue.'[2]

They were stricken with awe, they reverently took off her chains, fell down before her, worshiped at her shrine, and swore eternal fidelity to her cause! Their enthusiasm was turned into another and better channel; and the subsequent history of Chivalry and the Crusades contains the record of its mighty results.

After having subdued her conquerors by converting them, Christianity had to tame their ferocity, and gradually to civilize and enlighten them. And nobly did she accomplish these results. But she determined wisely to proceed gradually and slowly in the great work. She knew that all great beneficial changes, which are intended to affect whole masses, are slow and gradual in their operation, and that nothing which is violent is permanent. The sturdy oak, which has vanquished a thousand storms, has been for centuries acquiring its present firmness and solidity; while the earthquake and the tornado are the work of a moment.

A striking confirmation of this principle is exhibited in the literary history of the Middle Ages. Letters continued to decline for nearly five hundred years, until they reached their lowest stage in the tenth century; and then they gradually improved for about the same period, until they arrived at their highest point, or zenith, in the golden age of Leo X., about the beginning of the sixteenth century.[3] And this naturally leads us to the second point of our division, in which we will endeavor to give a rapid historical sketch of the various epochs of literature during the period in question.

1 Some of the Northmen had been partially imbued with the Arian heresy.

2 Dryden's Hind and Panther.

3 Hallam thinks that "the seventh century is the nadir of the human mind in Europe," though he admits that in England the darkness was greatest in the tenth. — Introduction, &c., sup. cit. I, 26.

Hosted by Google

II. In the fall of Rome, and the establishment of the Gothic kingdom in Italy under Odoacer, in 476, Literature received a heavy blow. Yet amidst the turmoil of war, and the storm of revolution, many were found in different parts of the fallen empire who devoted their time to letters.

In the sixth century, Vigilius Tapsensis wrote and published in Africa many works of considerable merit. Dionysius Exiguus, or the Little, became famous by inventing the Pashal Cycle, and settling the Christian era, about the year 516; and though his chronology has been thought to be slightly erroneous, yet it has been followed by all Christendom ever since his time. He was alike distinguished as an astronomer, historian, and theologian, and he would have reflected honor on any age. In the same century, Gregory of Tours wrote his History of the Franks, which is the foundation of all early French history. Italy was rendered conspicuous in the same age by two names, illustrious in philosophy and polite learning: Cassiodorus and Boethius, both of noble family and senatorial rank, but more illustrious far by their piety and devotion to letters. The former writing to the latter, praises him for having re-established Greek learning in Italy, and for having translated, for the benefit of his countrymen, the works of Pythagoras, Ptolemy, Euclid, Plato, Aristotle, and Archimedes.

About the middle of the seventh century (A. D. 669), Greek literature was introduced into England by Theodorus, the seventh archbishop of Canterbury, himself a Greek. St. Gregory the Great, by his virtues, enlightened mind, and patronage of learning, shone like a bright luminary in the center of Italy about the beginning of this century; while St. Isidore of Seville, by valuable works on almost every subject, laid open the treasures of learning to his countrymen in Spain. The compendious and encyclopedical character of his writings, was well adapted to an age, in which books were scarce, and could not be obtained without great difficulty. Towards the close of this century flourished the venerable Bede, the father of English history, whose name is in itself a sufficient eulogy. Beside his famous history, he wrote several works on Grammar, Music, Arithmetic, and other branches. The monastery of Lindisfarne became, under him, a radiating point of literature to all Europe.

St. John of Damascus, who is considered by some as the reviver of the dialectic or Aristotelian method of reasoning, flourished in the eighth century. In the same age Paul, the Deacon, wrote his valuable history of the Lombards, and Paulinus of Aquileia published several Latin poems of respectable merit. The close of this century is famed for a praiseworthy effort made by the emperor Charlemagne to stay the downward tendency of letters, and to infuse a new literary energy into Europe. Who has not heard of Alcuin, the learned English monk, employed by that great prince to carry into effect his intentions; of Peter the Deacon, of Pisa, his preceptor; of Eginhard, his secretary

Hosted by Google

and historian; and of many others whom this munificent patron of letters attracted to his court? He established in his palace regular conferences on literary subjects among the literati whom he gathered around him, and thereby laid the foundation of those academies and literary associations, which have subsequently done so much for the advancement of learning. Before the reign of Charlemagne, schools had been established in many of the monasteries and parishes in Italy, France, England, Ireland, Spain, and Germany; and he ordered by a public law, that seminaries of learning should be opened at every cathedral church throughout his vast empire.

Towards the close of the following century, a similar effort was made by Alfred the Great, of England, to re-establish learning in his kingdom. He was one of the most extraordinary men that ever lived. He fought fifty-four pitched battles with various vicissitudes of fortune, and yet, whether in the camp or in his palace, he invariably devoted one-third of his time to prayer and study. He made a law, that every man who owned two hides of land should send his children to school until they were sixteen years of age, and that his sheriffs and officers should apply to letters, or quit their offices. He translated many works into his vernacular language, and wrote several poems.[1]

It was the fate of the great men just named, to have their benevolent intentions in a great measure frustrated, by the imbecility and domestic feuds of their children and successors, and by the rude and evil nature of the times.

The tenth century is generally reputed the darkest of all the Middle Ages. It was natural that it should be so. The causes which brought about the decline of letters had been steadily operating for nearly five hundred years; and during this century unhappy Europe, already scourged for long ages, and bleeding at every pore, was invaded in the north by the Danes, in the center by the Normans, and in the south by the Saracens. Yet even in this iron age there were many illustrious men: Otho the Great, of Germany, whose praises were celebrated in a Latin epic poem of some merit, still extant, by Roswida, a cotemporary Saxon poetess; Ratherius and Luitprand of Italy, the latter of whom was a writer of considerable spirit and much wit, though his style is infected with much of the grossness of the age. Even during this century, the monks kept up their constant occupation of copying books; as is proved by the fact, that when the Saracens took and pillaged a monastery, near Novara in the north of Italy, they found, among the works in its library, copies of Virgil, Horace, and Cicero. The Poles, Hungarians, and a portion of the Russians, were also converted to Christianity during this century.

Hallam does not subscribe to the more generally received opinion, that the tenth was the least enlightened of the Middle Ages, at least so far as France and Germany are concerned. He says:

1 See Burke's Works, vol. ii. Abridgment of English History.

Hosted by Google

"But, compared with the seventh and eighth century, the tenth was an age of illumination in France. And Meiners, who judged the Middle Ages somewhat perhaps too severely, but with a penetrating and comprehensive observation, of which there had been few instances, had gone so far as to say, that 'in no age, perhaps, did Germany possess more learned and virtuous Churchmen of the episcopal order, than in the latter half of the tenth and beginning of the eleventh century.' Eichorn points out indications of a more extensive acquaintance with ancient writers in several French and German ecclesiastics of this period." [1]

III. From the beginning of the eleventh century, the prospects of Literature began to brighten. That and the following centuries could boast the names of Gerbert, Anselm, Lanfranc, St. Bernard, Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus, Roger Bacon, Scotus, and St. Thomas Aquinas. The last name alone would immortalize any age or country. How subtle and well balanced the mind, how deep the research, how accurate the reasoning of Aquinas! In strength, depth, grasp, and clearness of mind, he was the equal, in many other respects he was the superior, of Lord Bacon and Sir Isaac Newton, the much vaunted giants of English scientific literature.

The causes which brought about this favorable change in the literary condition of Europe are obvious. When, as above stated, she had been reduced to the lowest point of misery, a reaction was naturally expected. A practice, which obtained very extensively during that period, contributed much to bring about this reaction. Christians were in the habit of making pilgrimages to Rome and Jerusalem, to renew on the spots were they occurred a remembrance of the sufferings and triumphs of the apostles, martyrs, and of the Great King of Martyrs. This custom afforded the double advantage of causing men to visit or pass through places where literature was still cultivated, and of bringing them into more frequent contact with each other.[2] Whatever brings the masses of mankind into continual intercourse, tends to elicit talent, to stimulate inquiry, and to promote learning. The law of physical nature,— that inactivity produces disease, stagnation, or death, and that motion promotes health, vigor, and life,— is true also of the moral and literary condition of mankind.

The pilgrimages paved the way for a series of great and mighty events, which aroused Europe from her lethargy, united all her jarring elements, and concentrated her energies on one great object. The Crusades did more than this. They broke down the feudal system, enlarged the boundaries of dynasties, and drained Europe of most of those fiery spirits, who were conspicuous for nothing but stirring up civil feuds, or causing open wars. They originated a spirit of enterprise, stimulated commerce, threw men on their own resources, and taught them how to make those resources available. The old adage that "necessity

1 Introduction to Literature, etc., i, 28.
2 See Burke's works, ibid, ch. 2, v. 2. p. 514. et seq.

Hosted by Google

is the mother of invention,"—was never more fully verified, as we shall see in a subsequent part of this Lecture. In a political point of view, the Crusades were equally advantageous. They were a decisive blow in the great struggle which continued for centuries, between barbarism and civilization, between Asia and Europe, between the Crescent and the Cross! When the heroes who fought under Godfrey de Bouillon planted their glorious banner on the battlements of Jerusalem, in 1099, and made it float there triumphantly for nearly one hundred years, they planted a thorn in the side of Islamism, that did more perhaps than any thing else, to cripple that warlike monster, which was marching with giant strides, cimetar in hand, over the world, blighting and destroying every thing in its course. The fall of Constantinople was thus retarded perhaps for centuries, and while the Mussulmans were engaged at home with the invaders of their own territory, the Christians of Europe had time to repose, and to prepare for the still coming struggle.

That master stroke of policy,—that "carrying of the war into Africa,"—will reflect immortal honor on the political wisdom and searching forecast of Gregory VII. and Urban II., who planned and carried into execution those expeditions.[1]

The invention of the art of printing, by Guttenberg and Faust, in 1436;—the munificent patronage of letters by the houses of Medici, of Este, and of Gonzaga, and by the Popes in Italy;—the vast number of learned Greeks who fled to Europe on the taking of Constantinople by Mohammed II. in 1453, and the welcome which these men received, especially in Italy,—completed what the Crusades had begun. Literature progressed with giant strides in Italy, which had shone as a beacon light to the rest of Europe throughout the long period of the Middle Ages, and towards its close blazed up so brilliantly, as to excite the surprise, and to dazzle the eyes of mankind. There was a galaxy of genius in the golden age of Leo X., in the beginning of the sixteenth century,—very properly styled the second Augustan Age of Roman literature.

> But see each Muse in Leo's golden days
> Starts from her trance, and trims her withered bays;
> Rome's ancient genius o'er its ruins spread,
> Shakes off the dust, and rears his rev'rend head.
> Then sculpture and her sister arts revive,
> Stones leaped to form, and rocks began to live.
> With sweeter notes each rising temple rung;
> A Raphael painted, and a Vida sung.
> Immortal Vida! on thy honored brow,
> The poet's bays and critic's ivy grow;
> Cremona now shall ever boast thy name,
> As next in place to Mantua, next in fame!

1 That this motive was combined with the enthusiastic desire to recover the holy land, desecrated by the Mussulmans, is manifest from the Acts of the Council of Clermont in 1095, and from the speech of Urban II., in this council, which is a master piece of eloquence and political wisdom.

Hosted by Google

IV. Were the middle ages as *dark* as they are usually represented by Protestant historians? How much do we owe to that period? I might rather ask, what is there in Literature and the Arts that we do *not* owe to those ages? We owe to them the ancient Grecian and Roman Literature, which but for the care and indefatigable industry of men who deserve every praise, and who receive nought but sneers, would have been utterly and irretrievably lost, amidst the storms and revolutions which swept over Europe during the greater part of that period.

Two institutions of the Catholic religion greatly contributed to this happy result: the preservation of the Latin language in the public service, and the monastic orders. The former imposed upon all candidates for orders the obligation of learning the Latin language and of studying the ancient Roman literature, and thereby afforded them a powerful inducement to preserve the master-pieces of Roman composition;[1] while the latter opened sacred retreats and holy sanctuaries for learning, while the rude storm of war was sweeping over the world, destroying in mankind all relish for letters, and desolating the proudest monuments of Literature and the Arts.[2] The monasteries were generally situated in remote solitudes, or amidst mountain rocks and torrents; they offered little inducement to the plunderer, besides being almost inaccessible to his clans. It was one of the stated rules of the monks of St. Benedict, to devote a portion of their time to study and to copying books, and in the quietness of their cells, by their untiring industry, they preserved and transmitted to us the precious treasures of ancient classic Literature. Enlightened men of every religious creed have done justice to the monks. And yet it is the fashion at the present day to sneer at these deserving men, in season and out of season; and every valiant knight, who, booted and spurred, mounts his fiery Rosinante; and dashes in among the hooded monks of the dark ages, scattering them hither and yon, as he of La Mancha did the flock of sheep, thinks that he has achieved a brilliant exploit!

We have now before us a list of TWENTY-FIVE great improvements and inventions, which we owe to those much abused ages, many of them of vast and paramount importance to society.

1st. At the head of the list deserves to be placed, on account of its great influence on modern refinement, the elevation of female character, for which we are mainly indebted to the chivalry of the Middle Ages. When the Northmen were converted to the Catholic faith in the fifth and the following centuries, they learned, along with other teachings of Christianity, that the Saviour God whom they adored vouchsafed to be born of a woman, to call her *Mother*, and to be subject to Her. The high honor thus divinely conferred upon MARY, was reflected from her upon her whole sex; just as the disobedience and consequent dishonor of Eve had bowed down woman to the dust, marked by the serpent's

1 See Burke's works. vol. 2, Abridgment of Eng. History, c. 2, p. 514 et seq.
2 Burke, ibid.

Hosted by Google

trail. The generous Northmen caught up at once this idea, so just and so beautiful, and their enthusiasm in honor of the sex was aroused. The principles of medieval chivalry were developed; but the feeling outstripped the principle, and woman suddenly found herself raised as much above her true level in society, as she had hitherto been degraded below it. The humble daughter of Mary was thus far exalted above the proud daughter of Eve. But the extravagant excesses of chivalrous devotion to the sex were curbed by the holy principles of religion; and the result of these elements and causes, is the station which woman now occupies in society. Under Paganism she was the slave or toy of man; the creature of his caprice, or the victim of his tyranny. Even the more polished society of ancient Greece and Rome afforded but very imperfect exceptions to this remark. Thanks to Christianity and to the Middle Ages, she has ceased to be the slave, and has been made the companion of man: from being the drudge of society, she has become its ornament and refiner.

The restoration of woman to her proper station in society had a powerful influence on civilization and Literature. Even the extravagancies of chivalry had their beneficial results. Female influence not only prompted to deeds of valor, but also stimulated men to triumphs in poetry and Literature; the delicate hands of woman wove not only the chaplet which decorated the warrior's brow, but also the laurel and the ivy wreath, which adorned the brow of genius.

Women did more at that period than exert a mere influence; they acted their own parts. Who has not heard of the famous Joan of Arc, the maid of Orleans, who at the tender age of seventeen, led the disheartened troops of France to deeds of heroic valor, retrieving the fortunes of her country conquered by a foreign foe; driving the English from more than half of France, and finishing her mission by crowning Charles VII. King of France, at Rheims, which but a few months previously was in the very heart of the territory conquered by the enemy? Nor are her laurels stained by the fact, that when taken by her enemies, she was, at the instigation of the Duke of Bedford, condemned and inhumanly burned as a sorceress and witch![1] Who has not heard of Queen Margaret of Sweden, the Semiramis of the north, who in the thirteenth century, by her political prowess, united all the jarring elements of northern Scandinavia into one vast kingdom? Or of Anna Comnena, the authoress of the famous Alexiad, in the twelfth century? Or of more than one lady who during that period taught philosophy and belles lettres in the University at Bologna[2]—not to mention Heloise, skilled in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew learning, upon whose story many moderns have raised so man extravagant and ridiculous fictions?

1 Twenty years afterwards, in 1451, Pope Calixtus III, had her sentence revoked, and pronounced her a patriot and martyr.

2 The most famous of these femmes savantes, were Modesta di Pozzo, Cassandra Fidele, Isabella di Cordova, Isabella de Roseres, Catharine Ribera, and Aloysia Sigea.—[See Robelot, Influence de la Reformat. p. 339.]

Hosted by Google

2. We owe all our Modern Languages to the Middle Ages: the Italian, with its sweetness; the French, with all its grace and delicacy; the Spanish, with its stern dignity; the German and English with all their force and richness. The Italian may be considered as the first daughter of the Latin, the most soft and comely; the French as the second daughter, less fair than her elder sister, but possessed of more tact and more varied graces; and the Spanish, not as the *daughter*, but as the *son*, of the Latin, with the stern features and manly voice of the parent. It is a matter of surprise, how languages so beautiful and perfect could have sprung from amidst the constant turmoil and confusion of those ages; and especially, how the Italian, so sweet and musical, could have resulted from the union of the Latin, itself not remarkable for sweetness, with the harsher sounds of the North. We are forcibly reminded of a fable in heathen mythology: — as the Cytherean Venus, the *beau ideal* of ancient perfection in beauty, was fabled to have sprung from the froth of the sea; so the Italian, the softest and most beautiful of modern languages, may be said to have sprung, in all its symmetry and beauty of form, from the froth of a sea agitated by continued storms and revolutions.

Whatever theory we may adopt on the question, whether language be a divine gift, or merely a human invention, or a result of both agencies combined, there can be no doubt as to the merit which attaches to its full development and cultivation. A rich, strong, precise, or melodious language indicates corresponding qualities in the people who employ it as a medium of thought; and we know of no instance in which a fully developed and highly cultivated language does not betoken a refined literary taste.

3. We owe all our Modern Poetry, and also the introduction of rythm into poetry, to those ages. Italy, as usual, led the way. The rude laws of the Troubadours, in the twelfth, prepared the world for the *Divina Commedia* of Dante, in the thirteenth century. His effusions were followed by the noble strains of Petrarch, who was crowned with laurel at Rome in the fourteenth century. The English poet Chaucer was the friend, but by no means the equal of Petrarch; his taste was often vitiated by too great attachment to the rhymes of the Troubadours, and he imitated too servilely his great Italian cotemporary.

4. The Paper upon which we write was invented in the Middle Ages. From ancient MSS. it appears that cotton paper was used in Italy as early as the tenth century, while linen paper seems to have been introduced in the fourteenth.[1] We now reap the fruits of an invention, which has made the material upon which we write and print so cheap, as to be accessible to all. Before the invention of paper, parchment, and papyrus, the latter an article manufactured from a plant in Egypt, were chiefly used; but they were both rare and expensive. When the Saracens over-

1 This date for the invention of linen paper is assigned by Tiraboschi. Hallam fixes it earlier. — in 1100. — Introduction, &c., 1..50, supra cir.

Hosted by Google

ran Egypt, in 641, the importation of papyrus into Europe seems to have ceased ; and, to the inventive genius of the Italians, thus thrown on their own resources, we owe the present material, superior to it in every respect.

5. The glory of having invented the Art of Printing, also belongs to the period of which we are speaking. I allude not only to the Art as invented by Guttenberg or Faust, in 1436, at Strasburg and Mentz, but also to an invention of a much earlier date, which was only extended and improved by the persons above named. I mean the invention of *Chirotypography*, or printing by hand, of which undoubted traces are found in many ancient diplomas, as old as the tenth century, and in some illuminated works of equal antiquity, hitherto viewed as manuscripts. A learned Italian, the Abbate Requeno, in a work published a few years since at Rome, has amply established this fact; of which, however, I have been unable to find mention in any work of standard English literature : — and yet it is fashionable for our standard writers to sneer at the ignorance of the Italians, though to them Literature certainly owes more than to any other nation. Requeno proves that two kinds of hand printing were in use, — the impression was sometimes taken by plates with letters carved on them, sometimes by moveable types of wood, or ivory, or metal. Only one step was wanting to render this invention valuable, and to multiply copies, — *the Press;* and Guttenberg made this step. It should be recollected, however, that it is easy to add to inventions already made : *facile est inventis addere*. It is a remarkable fact, in both stages of the history of this invention, that the first mode adopted was that which afterwards constituted the highest perfection in the art : viz., the use of stereotype plates, which Guttenberg abandoned in favor of moveable types, because he knew of no way of casting the former, to render them available.

6. The Illuminated Manuscripts of the Middle Ages show that the art of penmanship was then carried to a degree of perfection, which it has never since attained. Who that has seen those manuscripts, has not admired their splendid pictorial illustrations, their taste and exquisite beauty ! The use of gold and silver ink, seems also to have been common at that period; and in the Vatican library, at Rome, there is preserved a splendid illuminated manuscript copy of the New Testament in Greek, as old as the eleventh century, and written entirely in letters of gold ! I doubt whether our modern artists could produce any thing equal, or even similar to this splendid specimen of art.

7. Universities were first founded in those ages. To them we owe the two great English Universities ; Oxford, founded in 886 by Alfred the Great, and Cambridge in 915 ;[1] the famous University of Paris, said to have been first established by Charlemagne, about the year 800 ;[2] — and

1 Some writers believe that the schools founded by Alfred did not become universities until some time in the twelfth century. See Hallam — Introduction to the Literature of Europe, &c., vol. 1, p 32.

2 The same remark may be made in regard to this famous school, which, though claimed to have been founded by Charlemagne, did not probably acquire a charter of rights as a university, until about two centuries later. See Hallam, *ibid.* p. 30.

Hosted by Google

the perfect galaxy of Italian Universities, at Rome, Bologna, Padua, Pavia, and Pisa, which became famous in the twelfth and following centuries, and which counted their students not by hundreds, but by thousands. The University of Padua, the *alma mater* of Christopher Columbus and Americus Vespuccius, is said to have contained, at one time no less than 18,000 students. The University of Oxford contained, in the thirteenth century, according to the testimony of its historian Anthony Wood, a Protestant, no less than 30,000 students.[1]

The Pandects of Justinian were discovered in the eleventh century: and the study of the civil and canon law was shortly after revived by the famous Irnerius or Werner, in the University of Bologna. Youths from all parts of Europe frequented this and the other Italian Universities, and returned to their native countries, to diffuse among their countrymen the stores of knowledge they had thus accumulated. Italy thus became the radiating point of Literature to all Europe, and her Universities contributed, perhaps as much as any other cause, to the revival of learning and to the march of civilization. The University of Paris deserves great praise for having contributed its full portion to the good work. Medical schools were also established at Salerno, in the south of Italy, in the eleventh century, (some say the seventh), and at Montpelier and Paris, in the twelfth; and thus the science of medicine was revived. In all these improvements, the monks acted a very conspicuous part.

In concluding this subject, I will remark, that of the two English Universities, Oxford has five halls and twenty colleges, aud that *all her halls*, and twelve of her Colleges, were founded and endowed before the year 1516! Cambridge has seventeen colleges, of which twelve were founded before 1511; — from which fact it would appear that, notwithstanding all our boasting, the *dark* ages have done more for Literature than a more *enlightened* period!

8. Who is so dull of ear, as not to be delighted with the harmony of musical sound? We owe to the *dark* ages, an invention unknown to the ancients, by which Music has become a science, taught upon regular principles. Guido of Arezzo, an Italian monk, by inventing the notes of the *gamut*, in 1124, did for Music, what the inventor of alphabets did for language,— reduced sounds to simple and systematic rules. He also invented many musical instruments, such as the cymbal and heptachord. While on this subject, we may remark, that Organs were either invented in Italy, or at least introduced into Europe by the Italians, in the eighth century; and that the use of Bells in churches may be dated back to the year 605 of the Christian era.

9. But we are indebted to those abused ages, for another invention, which has perhaps had as great an influence as any other in advancing the cause of civilization, and extending the boundaries of human knowledge. And it is in consequence of this invention that we tread the soil of this vast continent, which but for it, would never probably have been

1 *Athenæ Oxonienses.*

Hosted by Google

discovered by the civilized world. We mean the Mariner's Compass. The precise date of this invention is not known; but it is spoken of by French and Italian writers in the twelfth century. The Amalfites, enterprising mariners in the south of Italy, seem to have been the first to apply it to navigation.

The invention at its first stage was rude and simple enough. The magnetized needle was placed in a vessel of water, upon pieces of straw or two split sticks; and it was evidently of little use when a vessel was agitated by a rough sea. About the close of the thirteenth century, *Flavio di Gioja*, an Italian of Pasitano, a village near Amalfi, devised a method by which this inconvenience was obviated: he suspended the needle on a pivot placed at its center, and it thus became available under all circumstances. The box, with the points of the Compass marked on its rim, was added, and thus the invention was completed, though it was subsequently much improved. The *fleur de lis* is said to have been placed at the North Pole, in honor of the royal house of France, which then controlled the government of Naples, whose subject *di Gioja* was.

The ancients knew something of the loadstone, but never thought of applying it to navigation. Some writers, whose spirit leads them to detract as much as possible from Christian nations, and to give the merit of every thing to Pagans, have contended that the Chinese invented the Mariner's Compass. It is, however, certain, from the letters of the earliest missionaries to China, that the species of compass formerly used by the Chinese was entirely different from our magnetic needle. And if we consider the truly wonderful progress which this *very enlightened* people have since made in navigation, with their beautiful junks, as broad as they are long, plowing the deep, we will certainly feel disposed to award them every honor and glory; especially as they make themselves some thousands of years older than the world!

10. The invention just mentioned led to other great improvements. The frequent and extensive voyages undertaken by Italian navigators, greatly increased the amount of geographical knowledge. The travels of Rubruquis, and Marco Polo, the famous Venetian navigator, as well as the written account of the Catholic missionaries, who, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, penetrated into the very heart of Asia, threw additional light upon the history, manners and customs, and geography of those distant nations. From the ancient map made by Marco Polo, and recently published, with learned essays, by the late Cardinal Zurla, it appears manifest that Polo doubled the Cape of Good Hope, and visited Madagascar. The Canary Islands were also discovered by the Portuguese, in the thirteenth century. Thus was the way prepared for the discovery of America by Columbus, in 1492.

11. Commerce was also carried on with spirit and vigor from about the same time, and the products of the whole world flowed into Europe. Italy here also led the way. The Venetian, Genoese, and Pisan republics, carried on an extensive trade with Asia and Egypt. The Venetians,

Hosted by Google

from the year 1096, the era of the first crusade, became the carriers of Europe. Another powerful commercial league sprang up in the thirteenth century, in the north-western part of Europe. The Hanseatic league, which began in 1241, with the two cities of Hamburg and Lubeck, comprised in 1370 no less than sixty-four cities and forty-four allies.

12. The first Bank was founded at Venice in the year 1157. To facilitate commercial intercourse, bills of exchange (lettere di cambio) were also introduced into Italy about the same time.

13. The increased intercourse among mankind for commercial purposes, and the necessity of carrying on regular correspondence with distant persons, suggested the idea of a Post-Office. We read that the University of Paris, and the Italian Universities, as early as the twelfth century, established regular *couriers* through all parts of Europe, for the purpose of enabling the students to correspond with their parents, and to collect money to pay their expenses. Such was the humble commencement of an institution, which has since been so far extended and perfected, as to ramify throughout the whole world, and to furnish a regular medium of intercourse for the most distant nations. We may here remark, *en passant*, that the first Newspapers were published in Venice, in 1562.

14. We also owe to the period of which we are speaking, an invention which enables old persons to read, and prevents those who are afflicted with shortsightedness from falling into many disasters, which would otherwise beset this afflicted class of human beings. Spectacles for the old and shortsighted were first constructed by Salvino, a monk of Pisa, in Italy, in 1285. Some writers award the merit of this invention to the famous English monk, Roger Bacon. It is, however, probable, that he never constructed spectacles; though in his *Opus Majus* he certainly explains the principle upon which they should be made. He also unfolds the principle of the telescope, microscope, and magic lantern; and he speaks of a certain inextinguishable fire, which is generally understood to mean phosphorus. In the same work he speaks of a certain composition of saltpetre, sulphur, and charcoal, which would imitate the sound and brilliancy of thunder and lightning, and one square inch of which ignited would destroy a whole army or city. Hence some have considered him the inventor of

15. Gunpowder, of which he certainly had a clear idea. It is however probable that his knowledge was confined to theory and a few experiments.[1] Schwartz, a monk of Cologne, seems to have been the first who manufactured gunpowder, about the year 1320. Cannons were used in the battles of Crecy and Poictiers, towards the close of the fourteenth century. If the Chinese historians deserve any credit, the celestial empire had the merit of inventing gunpowder, long before this world was made! As early as the year 688, a composition, called the

1 He died in 1292.

Hosted by Google

Greek fire, was employed by the orientals, especially in sea fights: but all agree that it was not *our* gunpowder. A work is still preserved in the University of Oxford, England, written in the ninth century by one Gracchus, who describes a compound nearly resembling that of which we are treating.

No invention has perhaps exerted a more powerful, and I believe a more beneficial influence on the destinies of the world, than that of this terrific agent. It has entirely changed the aspect of war. It has affected fortification, ship building, and has wholly changed military tactics. Besides its beneficial influence on internal improvements, it has, strange to say, softened and mitigated the horrors of war, and greatly diminished the number of those who fall in battle. Armies formerly engaged in mortal combat face to face, and fought for whole days, often returning to the combat, nor was victory obtained until one or the other army was nearly annihilated; men now fight at a distance, and the contest is soon decided. Thousands fell formerly, where hundreds fall now. Compare any great ancient battle with any decisive modern engagement, and you will be convinced of the truth of this remark. Take for example two of the most decisive engagements recorded in history: the battle of Waterloo, and that between Poictiers and Tours in 732, when Charles Martel defeated the Saracens. In the former, the total amount of killed and wounded on both sides was about 55,000, of whom perhaps not half were killed; whereas in the latter the Saracens alone had 100,000 — some say 300,000 killed.

16. Stone Coal, which has since proved so extensively useful, in private residences and in manufactories, was discovered in England in 1307.

17. The Arabian arithmetical Numbers were introduced into Europe by the famous Gerbert, afterwards Pope Sylvester II., about the year 991. Thus the foundation of arithmetic was laid, and the science of mathematics began from this time to be extensively studied. Algebraic calculation was also introduced into Europe by the Italians, in 1412.[1]

18. Though the ancient Greeks and Romans were acquainted with Glass, yet they seem never to have used it in windows. This improvement in the comforts of life, was generally adopted in Europe in the Middle Ages. The first mention of glass windows occurs in writers of the third and fourth century.

19. A method of staining glass was generally known and employed during that period, which has since been lost. Efforts were made during the last century in Germany and France to revive this beautiful art, but with very imperfect success. The solemn and mellow light of the old Gothic churches, which tends to inspire us with pensive, yet pleasing emotions, is owing to the use in them of stained glass.

1 The Arabians have the credit of these inventions. They also excelled in medicine. They learned much from the works of the ancient Greek authors, whom this active and enterprising people translated. This is about all that can be said in favor of the literature of the fanatical followers of Mohammed, at least in its relation to the European literature of the Middle Ages. Yet some authors would wish to convey the impression that what we do not owe to the Chinese, we have derived from the Arabs!

Hosted by Google

20. The chief sufferings of Europe during the Middle Ages grew out of the neglect of Agriculture. The monks applied themselves early to this useful art, and taught others how to practice it. The monasteries were generally situated in remote and desert places; the monks reclaimed the soil, drained the marshes, fertilized even the rocky mountain tops, and improved whole districts. They also taught the people other useful arts. Thus, when the people of Sussex in England were perishing with hunger during a famine, in 605, Bishop Wilfrid at the head of his monks, plunged into the sea in presence of the assembled multitudes, and thus opened to them a new source of subsistence, of which their ignorance or druidical superstitions had hitherto deprived them.[1]

21. The monks also cultivated Botany, and studied the medical qualities of plants. The clergy were in many places the only physicians. It is a remarkable feature in that age, that every pursuit was referred to, or connected with, religion. The names of flowers were taken from some supposed aptitude to recall religious reminiscences. The passion-flower, the marygold, and others are examples of this. How beautiful and poetical the turn of thought, which suggested the idea of the Floral Calendar, by which the plants, in their different times of flowering, marked the division of time, and pointed to the holy festivals of religion! This was truly giving to the flowers a *language*, which spoke of God and his saints — of religion — of Heaven!

> "What a lovely thought to mark the hours,
> As they floated in light away;
> By the opening and the folding flowers,
> That laugh unto the summer's day!"

22. The Clock was invented in the Middle Ages. The invention is prior to the twelfth century, though the author of it is not clearly known. The phrase, "the clock has struck," was common in the twelfth century. Some award the honor of the invention to the famous Gerbert, already mentioned, who certainly put up a clock for Otho the Great, at Magdeburg, about the year 1000. Others ascribe it to the Italian monk Pacificus, and others to the Abbott William, of Hirschau in Germany. It is probable that they all contributed their share to the invention, at nearly about the same time. It is a remarkable fact in the history of human knowledge, that in its progress many learned men in different places hit simultaneously upon the same invention. Every scholar has heard of the controversies between the friends of Gallileo and Huygens about the application of the *pendulum* to clocks; between Newton and Hook and the Bernouillies, about the first discoverer of the laws of attraction; and between Newton and Leibnitz about the authorship of the *fluxional or integral calculus*. Before the invention of clocks, the sun-dial, the hour-glass, and the Clepsydron, constructed on the principle of water dripping through a small orifice,— were the only instruments used for measuring time.

1 See Burke's Works, Vol. II, p. 514, et seq.

Hosted by Google

in the openings of the clouds, a star brightly glimmering, and filling his bosom with hope. The great Leibnitz was one of those "bright, particular stars." His vast and luminous mind not only led him to eschew prejudice, but conducted him to the very portals of the sublime temple of Catholic truth.[1] To understand his testimony, we must remark, that the Abbé Rancé, the founder of the order of Trappists in France, was opposed to the special cultivation of Literature by the monks of his order. He wished them rather to spend their time in prayer, and in agricultural pursuits. His opinion was singular, and in fact unprecedented in monastic history, as we trust to make appear in the course of this essay. The learned Benedictine, Mabillon, entered the lists, and in a very learned and able work on "Monastic Studies,"[2] completely demolished the position of his adversary. Leibnitz, adverting to the same opinion, says: "If that opinion had obtained, we would have no erudition at the present day. For it is manifest that both books and letters have been preserved by the aid of the monasteries."[3] He instances the famous monastery of Corbeia, "which, through its monks, excelling not less in learning than in piety, spread the light of the faith throughout the entire north" of Europe.[4]

To this splendid testimony in favor of the monks, we add that of Ellendorf, another distinguished German Publicist. He testifies that, "without the clergy, and chiefly without the monks, we would not have now the works of the fathers, nor of the classics."[5] We might also, were it deemed necessary, add the testimonies of Voigt, of Hurter,[6] and of many other late German Protestant writers. Their works are comparatively recent and are well known to the learned; and besides, the passages from their writings which would illustrate our subject, are too numerous and too copious to find a place in a paper which must be necessarily brief. Thus the first part of Europe which rebelled against Catholicity, was also the first to do it a measure of justice.

Turn we now to England, of which we may say with some truth, what St. Leo the Great said in substance of Pagan Rome: that she has afforded an asylum to sects of every hue, and has patronized and defended the errors of all innovators. One of the most accomplished Protestant writers, Edmund Burke, in his "Abridgment of English History,"[7] bears abundant testimony to the services which the English monks of the "*dark*" ages rendered to Literature and to civilization. He proves that, besides copying books and gratuitously teaching the poor

1 In his Systema Theologicum, which the writer of this paper possesses, in German and Latin, this great Protestant Philosopher explains and defends almost every doctrine of the Catholic Church. The work was published after his death, and its authenticity is unquestioned.

2 De Studiis Monasticis, vol. i, 4to.

3 "Si ea invaluisset opinio, nullam hodie eruditionem haberemus. Constat enim libros et literas monasteriorum ope fuisse conservatos."—Tom. v, Opp. Ep. 14.

4 "Quæ, monachis doctrina non minus quam pietate præstantibus, fidei lumen per totum septentrionem sparsit."—Ibid.

5 De Hierarchia, tom. i, c. 4.

6. He has since become a fervent Catholic.

7 See his works, in three volumes, octavo. Vol. ii, ch. ii, p. 514, et seq.

Hosted by Google